FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-191
Tuesday
2 October 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-191 CONTENTS *2 October 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

- Military Inspectors Complete Inspection in UK *[TASS]* 1
- Withdrawals from Germany Will Increase Security *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 1
- Deputy Defends Semipalatinsk Nuclear Testing *[NEDELYA 27 Aug]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- World War II Powers Suspend Rights in Germany *[TASS]* 5
- Two-Day CSCE Meeting Opens in New York 1 Oct 5
  - Bush Welcomes Delegates *[TASS]* 5
  - Envoy Comments on Cooperation *[TASS]* 5
  - Shevardnadze Gives Address *[TASS]* 6
- Shevardnadze, Foreign Officials Meet in New York 7
  - Meets With Yugoslavia's Loncar *[IZVESTIYA 30 Sep]* 7
  - Confers With Norwegian Minister *[TASS]* 7
  - Talks With Greek Counterpart *[TASS]* 8
- Soviet, European Parliament Talks Reported *[IZVESTIYA 28 Sep]* 8
- Lukyanov Receives Pugwash Movement Leaders *[TASS]* 8
- Commentators Reassess UN's Global Role *[Moscow Radio]* 9
- Full Use of UN Military Panel Urged in Gulf *[PRAVDA 20 Sep]* 10

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

- Shevardnadze, Bush Hold Talks at UN in New York 11
  - Talks Begin 1 Oct *[TASS]* 11
  - Bush Stresses End of Cold War *[TASS]* 11
  - Shevardnadze Interviewed *[TASS]* 12
- Commentary Views U.S. Impatience on Gulf Crisis *[IZVESTIYA 2 Oct]* 12
- U.S. General Powell Meets Moiseyev on Military *[TASS]* 13

China

- Signing of Border Protocol With China Planned *[Moscow TV]* 14
- Commentary Praises Relations With China *[Moscow International]* 14
- Chinese, Taiwanese Relations Examined *[Moscow International]* 14
- Vietnamese Official's Visit to PRC Eyed *[Moscow International]* 15

Northeast Asia

- Shevardnadze, ROK Counterpart Meet in U.S. 15
  - Progress in Ties Seen *[TASS]* 15
  - Discuss Regional Issues *[Moscow TV]* 16
  - Ties Said To Pose No Danger *[Moscow International]* 16
- Reports, Comments Assess Relations With ROK 17
  - International Talks in Seoul Eyed *[Moscow International]* 17
  - Soviet Official Views Ties *[Moscow International]* 18
  - ROK Diplomat Welcomes Relations *[TASS]* 18
  - DPRK Opposition Noted *[Moscow TV]* 18
  - Reports Provoke Irritation *[IZVESTIYA 25 Sep]* 19

Near East & South Asia

Saddam's Televised Statement on Gulf Viewed *[TASS]* 19
Soviet 'Specialists' Seek Departure From Iraq *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 39]* 20
Iraq Expels Iranian Opposition Group *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 20
Solutions for Situation in Afghanistan Offered *[TASS]* 21

East Europe

Polish Foreign Minister To Visit 10-15 Oct *[Moscow TV]* 22
Polish Demands for Compensation Examined *[PRAVDA 22 Sep]* 22

West Europe

Politburo's Semenova Receives FRG Minister *[PRAVDA 28 Sep]* 25
FRG Housing Project for Red Army Progresses *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Sep]* 25
FRG Firm Starts Joint Satellite Program *[Moscow TV]* 25
Azerbaijan Group Visits Turkey to Promote Ties *[PRAVDA 22 Sep]* 25
Metals Plant Polluting Norwegian Border Area *[Moscow TV]* 26

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Adopts Law on Freedom of Conscience *[TASS]* 27
USSR Supreme Soviet 1 Oct Session Outlined *[Moscow TV]* 27
Supreme Soviet Discusses Social Associations Bill *[TASS]* 28
Multiparty Law Adopted 'In Principle' *[AFP]* 28
Lukyanov Updates Deputies on Ukraine Situation *[TASS]* 29
Text of Resolution on New Union Treaty Published *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Oct]* 29

Political & Social

Russian Democratic Forum Program Criticized *[PRAVDA 28 Sep]* 30
Gorbachev-Yeltsin Ties Examined *[Leningrad Maritime]* 31
Italian Daily Interviews Yakovlev *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 27 Sep]* 32
Dzasokhov Examines CPSU's Contemporary Role *[Moscow Radio]* 34
PRAVDA Rejects Attacks on Communist Press *[28 Sep]* 34
Moscow's Organized Crime Examined *[London MOSCOW NEWS No 17]* 34
Bakatin Interviewed on Presidential Council, MVD *[SOYUZ No 37]* 36
Arbatov Accuses Critics of 'McCarthyism' *[Arbatov in MOSCOW NEWS 26 Aug]* 40
Sunday Newspapers Not Delivered in Some Cities *[PRAVDA 28 Sep]* 42
International Journalists Center Founded *[TASS]* 42
Press Leaders Hold Meeting on Independent Press *[TASS]* 42
Writers Union Leader Interviewed on Problems *[Moscow TV]* 43
KGB Officials, Propaganda Workers Meet *[Moscow Radio]* 43
Ryazan Makes Solzhenitsyn Honorary Citizen *[TRUD 25 Sep]* 43
Foreign Ships To Use Northern Sea Route *[Murmansk Maritime]* 43
New Trade Union Organizations Formed *[Moscow Radio]* 43
Laid-Off Kaliningrad Seaman Seek Foreign Employ *[Moscow TV]* 44
Seismic Tests Mistaken for Earth Tremors *[Moscow TV]* 44
'American' Business University To Open *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Sep]* 44
No-Confidence Vote Adopted at Academy of Sciences *[TASS]* 46
Shcherbakov Opens Socioeconomic Studies University *[TASS]* 46

Economic

Ryzhkov Advocates U.S. Economic Example *[Moscow Radio]* 46
Sobchak Notes Unions' Role in Market Transition *[Moscow Radio]* 47

- RSFSR Free Trade Union Congress Opens *[TRUD 19 Sep]* 47
- Union Leader Addresses RSFSR Unions Congress *[TRUD 19 Sep]* 48
- RSFSR Unions Seeks Data on Market Programs *[TRUD 23 Sep]* 52
- Metallurgists Appeal Over Switch to Market *[PRAVDA 24 Sep]* 52
- Only 'Registered' Locals Can Buy Food in Saratov *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 53
- Economic Woes, Rising Crime Noted in Penza *[Moscow TV]* 53
- Parts Shortage Said To Endanger Rail Safety *[GUDOK 20 Sep]* 53
- An-28 To Be Converted for Civilian Use *[Moscow Radio]* 55
- Deal Readied for Purchase of Printer's Supplies *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Sep]* 55
- Political Interference Alleged in Newsprint Output *[MOSCOW NEWS No 38]* 55

Agricultural

- Harvesting Emergency Declared in Krasnodar *[Moscow Radio]* 56
- Emergency Measures for Harvest in Vitebsk *[Moscow Radio]* 56
- Emergency Declared in Bryansk Oblast Harvest *[Moscow Radio]* 56
- Moscow Soviet Urges Citizens To Pick Potatoes *[Moscow Radio]* 56
- Moscow Officials Explain Potato Shortage *[TASS]* 56
- Council of Ministers Increases Meat Prices *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 Sep]* 57
- Feed Procurement Problems Affect Livestock *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 25 Sep]* 57

Military

- 'Shchit' Leader Cited on Coup Prospects *[Madrid ABC 28 Sep]* 59
- CPSU Members Desired as Political Officers *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Sep]* 60
- CPSU Central Committee Secretary Meets Troops *[Moscow Radio]* 60
- 'Last' Baltic Nuclear Submarine Decommissioned *[Moscow Radio]* 60
- Contract To Raise Komsomolets Signed *[Moscow Radio]* 60

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

- Coverage of Lithuania-USSR 2 Oct Negotiations 61
  - Talks To Start 2 Oct *[IZVESTIYA 2 Oct]* 61
  - Ryzhkov Confirms Talks *[Vilnius Radio]* 61
  - Delegation Meets Before Departure *[Vilnius Radio]* 61
  - Landsbergis Leads Delegation *[Vilnius Radio]* 61
  - Prunskiene Comments Prior to Talks *[Vilnius International]* 61
  - Lithuanian Spokesman Cited *[TASS]* 62
  - Talks Begin 2 Oct *[TASS]* 62
  - Goal To Set Up 'Negotiations' *[Vilnius Radio]* 62
  - Gorbachev 'Likely' To Participate *[East Berlin ADN]* 63
- Prunskiene 'Under Fire' as Economy Founders *[TASS]* 63
- Lithuanian Party To Hold Extraordinary Congress *[Vilnius International]* 63
- Lithuanian Domestic Political Scene Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Sep]* 63
- Independent Communist Official Rejects Party Law *[TASS]* 64
- Lithuanian Customs Posts To Police Exports *[Moscow TV]* 65
- Latvian Minister Asks for Western Support *[Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET 20 Sep]* 65
- Latvian Customs Begins Monitoring Imports *[Riga Radio]* 66

RSFSR

- Second Stage of Constituent Congress Assessed 66
  - Part One *[PRAVDA 18 Sep]* 66
  - Part Two *[PRAVDA 19 Sep]* 70
- RSFSR Supreme Soviet Briefed on Yeltsin Health *[TASS]* 73
- Analyses of '500 Days' Implementation Program 73
  - Supporter Defends Policy *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Sep]* 73
  - Supreme Soviet Examines Program *[Moscow Radio]* 79
  - Silayev Interviewed on Program *[Moscow TV]* 80

RSFSR Official Interviewed on Union Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 80
  Khasbulatov Urges Unity *[IZVESTIYA 25 Sep]* 81
Moscow's Socioeconomic Situation Called Explosive *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Sep]* 83
RSFSR Party Sensitive to Servicemen's Problems *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Sep]* 84
RSFSR Harvest Workers To Receive Benefits *[Moscow Radio]* 85
RSFSR Broadcasting Plans Outlined *[GOVORIT I POKAZYAVET MOSVKA 1 Oct]* 85
NOVYY MIR Registered in RSFSR *[Moscow TV]* 86
'Plethora' of New Publications Noted in Leningrad *[TASS]* 86
New Newspaper Published in Omsk *[Moscow Radio]* 86
Military Stops Journalists Visiting Novaya Zemlya *[IZVESTIYA 25 Sep]* 86
Natural Gas Deposit Confirmed in Irkutsk Oblast *[Moscow TV]* 87
Magadan Oblast Declares Land, Sea, Air Ownership *[Moscow Radio]* 87

Military Inspectors Complete Inspection in UK

LD2809220990 Moscow TASS in English 1923 GMT 28 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 28 TASS—A group of Soviet military inspectors completed an inspection of military activities in a designated area in Great Britain today.

The inspection was carried out in accordance with the final document of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security and Disarmament in Europe.

Withdrawals from Germany Will Increase Security

PM2809095590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent Ye. Grigoryev: "We Are Not the Only Ones To Leave"]

[Excerpts] Bonn—The question of Soviet troops was almost the most delicate one in the process of a definitive German settlement. Political, defense, practical, and indeed prestige considerations probably caused considerable concern in Moscow. Leaving while the Americans remain, when the link of the "GDR Army" is falling from the chain of the Warsaw Pact? But this knot was boldly and farsightedly cut by the Soviet side during the famous Soviet-West German summit in Zheleznovodsk. It was agreed there that our troops will leave German territory no later than the end of 1994. Now this is enshrined in the treaty on a definitive settlement regarding Germany, signed 12 September in Moscow by the foreign ministers of the FRG, the GDR, France, the Soviet Union, Britain, and the United States.

Formally, with respect to the Soviet troops, the accords do not affect in the slightest degree the fate of the NATO countries' armed forces on FRG territory. They merely set a "geographical limit" on their activities, which will continue not to exceed their present framework or, in other words, will not extend to the Eastern part of Germany. But is it an accident that the West German public and press are now more frequently addressing the question of the Western armed forces here as NATO allies? [passage omitted]

The new situation generated by Germany's unification raises the topical question of sending "home" a considerable proportion of these forces. This line has been formulated most clearly both politically and practically by France. President F. Mitterrand stated some time ago that with Germany's reunification and the restoration of its full sovereignty the reasons for the further stay of French troops on German soil disappear and France intends to withdraw them. Recently during the latest Franco-West German summit meeting in Munich, he confirmed this principled approach. Moreover, he announced the "first phase," when half the French troops in the FRG will be returned home.

It has become known that all its other allies have also notified Bonn of their intention to withdraw or at least drastically reduce their armed forces on West German territory. Thus, back in August the British Government announced that over the next five years the Rhine Army, including air forces, will be halved. It is not ruled out that eventually only one British armored division will remain here. Belgium has also officially notified the FRG Government that it will withdraw from Germany almost all its troops, some of which will be disbanded and discharged altogether. Brussels will soon announce the lists of the bases and other military establishments which will be returned to the Germans before 1993. The Dutch have decided on a gradual withdrawal of their troops: initially by 750 men in both 1990 and 1991.

And what about the Americans? Initially, prior to 1993, their armed forces in the FRG will be reduced by 60,000 men—to 190,000. But this, it is believed here, is "merely the intermediary stage." The unit servicing the cruise missiles withdrawn under the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles has been disbanded. It is obvious that when the elimination of the Pershings is completed the same fate will overtake the personnel of these missile units. Secretary of State J. Baker noted that the question of the numerical strength of U.S. troops in the future Germany remains open. But the press is already citing figures: 100,000 men in West Europe in all and as for German territory, FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE writes, "Washington is studying an option whereby the remaining troops will number approximately 60,000 men." [passage omitted]

The German media's military observers, however, are quite unanimous in believing that the NATO strategy of forward borders, essentially an attacking strategy, like the "flexible response" strategy, is receding into the past, although formally it has not been repealed. Public opinion and the mood of parliamentary and political circles are entirely obvious. The experts with whom I talked believe that the Bundeswehr and other NATO structures in the Western part of Germany will have to undergo further changes. They will be given an emphatically defensive nature capable of promoting the further buildup of the role of all-European security and cooperation structures.

All these facts, circumstances, and thoughts give a fuller idea of the military picture as it will in all likelihood take shape in a united Germany. It is already a fact that not only our troops will be withdrawn. This will undoubtedly merely increase security for us and for all Europe.

Deputy Defends Semipalatinsk Nuclear Testing

90SV0074A Moscow NEDELYA in Russian 27 Aug 90 p 4

[Report on interview with Colonel Nikolay Petrushenko, USSR People's Deputy, by Aleksandr Annin, NEDELYA correspondent; place and date not given:

"The Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Range: To Be or Not to Be? Thousands of People Await a Competent Answer to This Question"]

[Text] **At the end of May this year, the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] parliament decided to close the Semipalatinsk nuclear test range. However, it is apparent that it is not possible to resolve all ecological and social problems associated with Soviet nuclear weapons tests at one stroke. The republic deputies there and then found a lot of powerful opponents—both among the leadership of the country and among the higher military ranks. The test range has been "silent" for almost a year. Nonetheless, will explosions be continued or..? Whatever happens, no one is indifferent to this question. It was this that Olzhas Suleymenov, leader of the social antinuclear movement "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" and a USSR people's deputy, talked about in NEDELYA (No 23, 1990). We will recall that in response to the question of correspondents: Who is persistently against a complete ban on nuclear tests?—O. Suleymenov answered firmly: the military. Today, we give readers the opportunity to learn the view of opponents to the closing of the Semipalatinsk test range. Our correspondent's interlocutor is USSR People's Deputy Colonel Nikolay Petrushenko.**

[Annin] Nikolay Semenovich, you, perhaps, are one of the most well-known Army deputies of the Union parliament. You are a member of the deputy group "Soyuz," which is against the self-determination of the republics. You talked in February in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA about the lawfulness of the pitiful, well-known actions of our troops in Baku. Finally, you have been giving voice recently "to the defense" of the Semipalatinsk test range...

[Petrushenko] Many people number me among the ultrarightists. Not long ago a unique "diagram" for a Union parliament was published in the newspaper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI. There my name is among the extreme conservatives, and, for some reason, right alongside in the diagram is not only Ligachev, but also Gorbachev. However, I, like Gorbachev, am a realist.

[Annin] You consider the conduct of nuclear tests near Semipalatinsk to be an inescapable reality?

[Petrushenko] We will begin with the fact that radiation, as such, has become a reality of our life. I can assure you, only less than one-half percent of the average level of radioactive background in the USSR is caused by military nuclear tests. Responsibility for the remainder lies with industry, medicine, the agricultural industry, geology, and, finally, with the Ministry of Atomic Power. This is data of the scientific committee for the study of the actions of radiation established under the United Nations Organization.

[Annin] Let us assume that the one-half percent about which you are talking is a correct figure. But, you see, it is in relation to the average quantity of Union radioactive background. Would it not be proper to assume that in the area of the Semipalatinsk test range the situation, to put it mildly, is somewhat different?

[Petrushenko] There, where the atom is in the hands of qualified specialists, there is virtually no danger of radioactive contamination of the environment. Especially since enormous sums are expended at test ranges like Semipalatinsk to assure the complete safety of the population. Well, judge for yourself: A test range almost analogous to ours is located in the state of Nevada not far from the popular Las Vegas gambling business center. This says something...

[Annin] But this is in the United States. As for the Semipalatinsk test range, it was not so long ago that we all heard the statements of deputies and important scientists who spoke frankly about the danger of tests near Semipalatinsk to the health of local residents.

[Petrushenko] I know what you have in mind. I remember the chilling television appearance of Professor Aleksey Yablokov, a USSR people's deputy, who stated that after a regular underground nuclear test, a thousand children in the surrounding area had nosebleeds. I am not referring to those people who take such reports on faith. And I have been working for several consecutive months on the study of problems associated with the test range. I familiarized myself with a mass of documents, and I walked all over the test range in every direction. I descended into a tunnel where an explosion was conducted.

The dome-shaped tunnels are 650 meters deep. After an explosion, their granite walls are transformed into "glass" that is a meter thick. Even the slightest leak of radiation to the surface and into ground water is impossible. In the tunnels the level of radiation for several months after the explosion is such that you could open up an underground restaurant.

[Annin] Activists of the antinuclear movement "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" have declared publicly more than once that knowingly faulty instruments are used to measure the level of radiation in the test range area...

[Petrushenko] Olzhas Suleymenov accused me and some other deputies of this. He said that the "rightist" deputy group "Soyuz" went to the Semipalatinsk area with instruments that "lie."

In the first place, however, we invited all deputies to go on the trip who wanted to. And we conducted special tests using our own dosimeters. At first, in the Kremlin, where the level of radiation, you will agree, is continuously checked with maximum accuracy. Official readings and ours coincided. Afterwards, we tested the instruments at Domodedovo Airport. We compared our data with those obtained by the airport service. And that is what we did for the duration of the whole trip. Here are the figures: In Moscow, we established a radiation level on the average of thirteen microroentgens per hour; in an aircraft at an altitude of 10,000 kilometers—on the order of 260 microroentgens; in the city of Kurchatov, which is not far from the test range—11 microroentgens.

And in that place where in 1953 an overhead explosion of a hydrogen device was conducted, there is high radiation to this day—about 1,000 microroentgens per hour. At that time, in 1953, really more dangerous tests were conducted.

[Annin] In your opinion, it turns out that residents of eastern Kazakhstan are absolutely unjustifiably raising an alarm?

[Petrushenko] The mass of people, in my opinion, are being led astray. Now, in a period of general politicization, many political apologists quickly realized: Arousing passions regarding the test range, and the demand to close it (supposedly for the benefit of the people), is a powerful lever for a personal political takeoff.

[Annin] Is this not an old method, Nikolay Stepanovich, to accuse an enemy of self-interest?

[Petrushenko] But why spread fear among the inhabitants of several oblasts? In Semipalatinsk Oblast recently, specialists spent several hundred thousand rubles searching for increased radiation. They did not find it.

An interbranch commission that had 200 scientists did not succeed in doing this, and, in addition, more than two-thirds of the staff of the commission were specialists from Kazakhstan. Tests were made simultaneously over a wide territory, so to say, in "three copies." One each by the military, the interdepartmental commission, and by activists of the "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" movement. This was several months ago, but the results of the investigation were not published in the local press, which the "antinuclearists" insisted on at one time.

The fact is that the results of the tests were "politically disadvantageous" for them. But passions are continuing to heat up. The chief of the test range has been called a military criminal, although, if you look at it sensibly, he is only following an order and the will of the government.

Recently, crowds of people blocked the Kurchatov-Semipalatinsk road.

[Annin] As far as I know, the public is also dissatisfied that the test range territory is not used for pastures.

[Petrushenko] This is the situation. The test range occupies an area the size of approximately 18,000 square kilometers. The collective and state farms lay in more than a quarter million tons of hay annually. And hundreds of tons of fish are caught in a nearby lake. Continuous careful checks indicate that all of this product is clear of radiation. And the fish are generally wonderful, because there are no chemical enterprises alongside the lake.

[Annin] In short, you persistently defend the right to exist for the Semipalatinsk test range. How does this fit in with the instructions of your constituents, for you are a USSR People's Deputy from eastern Kazakh Oblast?

[Petrushenko] Of course, the voters in their instructions demand that I try to get the test range closed. But, it will be recalled that the USSR Constitution states that a people's deputy is guided by national interests and by taking into account the interests of the voters. The wording, in my opinion, is caustic. And I, of course, will fight for a halt to nuclear tests, but not in the way that this is done by the optimists in the "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" movement.

[Annin] In what way?

[Petrushenko] Perhaps my point of view is not fashionable, but I am for a ban on such tests by all nuclear powers, but not just by us in a unilateral manner. Carefully organized international verification is necessary for this. It does not exist yet. Meanwhile, the leaders of the "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" movement could be the ones to arrange such verification in contact with scientists of the city of Kurchatov.

Suleymenov and his companions are trying for a unilateral reduction in explosions at a time when newer weapons are being developed in the West. Our scientists do not lag behind Western scientists in the field of theory, but, in contrast to the United States (if we close the test range), we will not be able to verify ideas experimentally.

[Annin] You believe that the Western countries, and in particular the United States, continue to be our probable military enemy?

[Petrushenko] Times, of course, change, but the danger of the outbreak of a world war remains, especially on the part of such countries as Iran, Iraq...

And then the scientists of the city of Kurchatov are not only engaged in military developments. The institute has proved to be the only establishment capable of conducting research work on a program to eliminate the after effects of the Chernobyl accident. This is only one example of the "peaceful" activity of the test range. Nevertheless, the "antinuclearists" demand its complete shutdown, and this means the institute also. Nuclear physics is beginning to be persecuted just as genetics was in its time. I doubt that this occurs from ignorance.

There is one "little" nuance about which not everybody knows: If the test range is closed, and with it the state Scientific Research Institute in the city of Kurchatov, then a lot of housing will be freed. It appears that the leaders of the "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" movement want to solve the local housing problem at the expense of national science and thereby raise their own prestige in the eyes of the people.

I agree that many in Semipalatinsk Oblast live in crowded conditions, but why then be hypocritical and try to prove that it is dangerous to live in Kurchatov?

[Annin] Apparently, the problems of the Semipalatinsk test range are tied in with other difficulties of the region—social, economic...

[Petrushenko] However, today's activity of the activists of the local antinuclear movement can only exacerbate these problems. One of the program aims of the "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" society is to ban the burial of nuclear wastes on Kazakh SSR territory. Excuse me, but where should they be taken to? Other republics will hardly be pleased with such a "gift."

It is another matter that nuclear wastes have to be reliably concealed. But what do we have in fact? According to plans of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers, the republic will have to build six nuclear sarcophagi. Five to six million rubles of capital investment will have to be allocated for the construction of each one, plus a million rubles each for their maintenance. The establishment of the entire infrastructure of "sarcophagi" has been entrusted to the Ministry... of housing and communal administration of the republic. Rudely speaking, to people armed with a broom and a shovel.

[Annin] Is it not simpler and more reliable "to conceal" the radioactive wastes in the abandoned tunnels of the Semipalatinsk test range?

[Petrushenko] Exactly.

But this is impeded by public opinion that has been formed about the test range: We already have radioactive contamination, they say, and now they also want to toss us nuclear waste. So, what appears to be a noble campaign can turn into enormous, unnecessary expenditures. This means a further lowering in the people's standard of living.

The interview with Nikolay Petrushenko is only a continuation of a larger discussion about the fate of the Semipalatinsk nuclear test range. Everyone has a right to his own point of view, and in this case we learned the position of a person who is directly involved in the resolution of this question.

One may not agree with Nikolay Petrushenko about a lot of things and argue.

Therefore, the editorial office is ready to continue the discussion, opening its pages to his opponents also; to those who, nonetheless, are convinced of the need for a speedy closing of the Semipalatinsk nuclear test range.

World War II Powers Suspend Rights in Germany

LD0110210190 Moscow TASS in English 2042 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Text] New York October 1 TASS—The four World War II victors today announced they will suspend all their rights over Berlin and Germany, which they have exercised since 1945, from the moment East and West Germany unify on October 3.

The "Declaration on the Suspension of Operation of Four-Power Rights and Responsibilities" was signed at the Jacob Javits Conference Center by the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, and France.

It was also signed by West Germany's foreign minister and East Germany's minister for education and sciences.

The declaration says that the governments of the four World War II allies, represented by their foreign ministers, "in light of the Moscow treaty of September 12, 1991, on the final settlement with regard to Germany, declare that the effectiveness of their rights and responsibilities with regard to Berlin and Germany are suspended."

The suspension will run until the treaty comes into force.

The operation of related agreements and the activity of all related institutions of the four powers is also suspended.

The declaration was signed by French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and East German Education and Sciences Minister Hans-Joachim Meyer.

Two-Day CSCE Meeting Opens in New York 1 Oct

Bush Welcomes Delegates

LD0110231990 Moscow TASS in English 2053 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Matyash, Andrey Chytov, and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] New York, October TASS—Foreign ministers from 35 countries—participants in the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe—on Monday began their two-day meeting.

They are expected to discuss preparations for the parts CSCE summit, scheduled for November. Some sources believe there is a real possibility to reach major agreements in Paris in all directions of the Helsinki process and adopt decisions concerning the structure of a new Europe.

U.S. President George Bush welcomed participants in the meeting. He favoured reductions of conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe.

Envoy Comments on Cooperation

LD0110094590 Moscow TASS in English 0902 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Yuriy Kirilchenko, Andrey Sitov, and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] New York October 1 TASS—"The New York meeting among foreign ministers of 35 countries—participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)—is to give the green light to the Paris summit," the head of the Soviet delegation of the summit preparatory committee Ambassador Yuriy Deryabin told TASS.

"We have moved half way towards our goal," he said. The ministers have yet to sum up the work done and to step up these efforts. They are to confirm officially the date of the Paris summit, tentatively scheduled from November 19 to 21," Deryabin said.

"It is already clear that the main obstacles to the summit have been surmounted. Of course, there are still some unsettled issues at the talks on conventional armaments. There are also some points in the final document that have to be thrashed out. But I don't think these obstacles are unsurmountable," he added.

Turning to the significance of the Paris summit, Deryabin stressed that it will "undoubtedly be a major event in Europe's post-war history, comparable only to the 1975 Helsinki forum. It could be even more important in some ways. Paris will definitely bury the cold war," Deryabin stressed. In his opinion the Soviet Union's idea to call the Paris summit was immediately acclaimed throughout the world because new European, U.S. and Canadian leaders had emerged on the political arena. It was also dictated by the need to assess collectively the radical changes in Europe, to map out direction for further progress.

Dwelling capital, Deryabin noted an interesting detail. "Today," he said, "it is difficult to name the authors of various proposals. Many of our own initiatives echo some Western proposals. This refers to the mechanism of political consultations, regular summits and the proposal to set up a center to prevent and settle conflicts.

"But, of course, alternative proposals are also being made. The United States and the NATO nations have lately suggested a mechanism or some sort of procedure to hold free elections. This stems from the principle of the supremacy of laws, which is gaining recognition throughout the world today. A specific feature of the CSCE process is that formerly proposals by the Soviet Union or the West often ruled each other out, while today we are practiclly moving in the same direction. There is actually no confrontation now."

Shevardnadze Gives Address

LD0210000190 Moscow TASS in English 2334 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Text] New York October 2 TASS—Follows the full text of the speech by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze at the meeting of the foreign ministers of countries participating in the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe on October 1.

[Shevardnadze] Ladies and gentlemen, since our meeting is taking place during a session of the United Nations General Assembly we might call it a mini-assembly of Europe. We should also express our understanding of the problems which our hosts, the New York City authorities and municipal services, have had to face and which they have solved so efficiently.

Excellent arrangements have been made for our meeting, and we must thank the secretary of state, Mr. James Baker, for making it possible.

I think there is hardly any need for us to make general statements in this forum. The foreign ministers or leaders of most of our countries have already addressed the General Assembly, outlining their views of the world situation and setting forth their countries' positions on current problems.

This makes it possible for us to focus on the practical matters of our European agenda. It is a very broad agenda, and I would say a formidable one—in the best meaning of the word.

But before I turn to it, I would like to say that the Soviet delegation takes note of the information provided by Mr. Genscher on further steps related to the completion of German unification.

I do not think we should regret that the CSCE process will now have fewer participants. It will probably be fair and appropriate to express our gratitude to the German Democratic Republic for its contribution to the development of this process. Together with all of us, it helped set it in motion.

At the same time, we can welcome with satisfaction a united Germany. We believe this is a situation from which everyone stands to gain, a victory for the European cause and the CSCE process which takes on a new dimension.

On behalf of the Soviet Union we warmly congratulate the German people and wish the united Germany the best on a long journey in the European and global family of nations.

Let me now go back to our broader agenda.

We have before us the following main tasks related to the holding of a CSCE summit:

—to conclude the Vienna talks on the reduction of conventional armaments and on military confidence-building measures;

—to develop the basic framework of CSCE institutions and security structures;

—to prepare a declaration on new relations between members of the two military-political alliances;

—to draw up the guidelines for future development of the Helsinki process and to prepare for the next CSCE summit in Helsinki in 1992.

As our colleagues at the "twenty-three" talks in Vienna are aware, here in New York we have been able to find solutions regarding the key elements of the CFE agreement.

We can now assume that the agreement will be concluded. This opens the way to the CSCE summit meeting. I would say that the European disarmament train has made up for the delays that worried all of us. It is now on schedule and will arrive in Paris right on time.

It is our view that the preparatory committee has done a good job drawing up recommendations for the summit's agenda and for institutionalizing the Helsinki process. This makes it possible at the Paris conference to take a decision establishing the first CSCE bodies. The Soviet Union attaches priority to setting up a centre for the prevention and resolution of conflicts. We need such a center at a time of far-reaching and rapid changes in the politico-military situation in Europe.

We would like to point out that such a center is needed not just for carrying out certain functions. It could become a model for future democratic security structures that will transcend alliances. Once the center is established to deal with matters so sensitive for each country, any state will be able, on an equal footing with all others, to receive objective information on movements of troops and military equipment, on exercises and other military activities that the crisis prevention center will be asked by us to monitor. Until now such information has never been available outside the two alliances.

As Europe moves from the cold war to a new political era, a declaration on new, non-hostile relations between members of military-political alliances should, in our view, become a watershed between the two periods.

The rapid progress in drafting the declaration makes it clear that we shall have a major document reflecting not only the intentions of states but also, in many respects, the actual reality of the on-going transition to relations of cooperation and partnership.

The Moscow meeting of the Warsaw Treaty countries and the London session of the NATO Council gave the necessary impetus in this regard.

Let me emphasize that we are not writing an alliance-to-alliance document. It will be a document for the whole of Europe, both in spirit and in form. All states may wish to support it. And I think they will.

The Paris summit is to formulate new guidlines for further development of the CSCE process toward what we call Helsinki-2.

In this context, I would suggest that we have every reason to anticipate even more dramatic improvements in the European political climate if the Paris summit produces the expected results. Vast opportunities and prospects for practical action in all areas of the Helsinki process will undoubtedly open up after the summit.

Still, I have some misgivings as to whether all of us are psychologically prepared for dynamic progress on a broad agenda. The past is still with us. It still holds us back and sometimes keeps us from raising our sights. This is only natural. Adaptation to new realities is a continuing process.

I do not want to be misunderstood as favoring hasty action or movement for movement's sake. In my opinion, today we need to reassess the role of the time factor in politics. Indeed, we are now able to achieve in a matter of months or even weeks what used to take us years or seemed altogether impossible.

We have reached agreement in principle that we have to move toward a single European space in the legal, humanitarian, cultural, economic and environmental areas.

The time has come for us to get to work on specific programs and to look for practical ways of building a peaceful, democratic and united Europe. We can place great hopes on the emerging political structures of the CSCE process, including regular meetings of heads of state and government, conferences of ministers—not only foreign ministers—and other arrangements which make it possible for the CSCE countries to stay in touch and to keep pace with the events. It is very important to link the emerging institutions and structures with those already existing in Europe and establish close interaction among them.

Without exaggeration, we have enormous tasks ahead of us. Our first task is to make this year's CSCE summit a success.

We know from experience that good results are possible if we have an active political mechanism for preparing recommendations and decisions, if permanent channels of communication are open between our foreign ministries and if we, dear colleagues, regard the promotion of the Helsinki process as a matter of high priority.

Please consider this a commitment on my part to act precisely on this matter.

Shevardnadze, Foreign Officials Meet in New York

Meets With Yugoslavia's Loncar

PM0110141590

[Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 30 September 1990 in its Morning Edition carries on page 4 under the headline "Diplomatic Contacts in New York" a 1,200-word TASS report datelined New York, 29 September, on USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze's meetings with various foreign ministers and other dignitaries. The report includes the following passage:

"During E.A. Shevardnadze's talks with B. Loncar, SFRY federal secretary for foreign affairs, the sides' intention to build up constructive, mutually advantageous cooperation between the USSR and the SFRY in all areas was confirmed.

"During a discussion of international questions E.A. Shevardnadze and B. Loncar noted the closeness of approaches and advocated strengthening cooperation between the USSR and the SFRY in the interests of world peace and security.

"The SFRY federal secretary for foreign affairs spoke about Yugoslavia's activity in the post of chairman of the Nonaligned Movement. Both ministers emphasized the movement's increased role and significance in the matter of improving international economic relations and in settling regional conflicts."

Confers With Norwegian Minister

LD0110204790 Moscow TASS in English 2023 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Maslov, Yevgeniy Menkes, and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] United Nations October 2 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his Norwegian counterpart Kjell Magne Bondevik on Monday signed an agreement between the governments of the two countries on the prevention of incidents on sea outside territorial waters. This is the first military-political agreement between the two countries.

During their meeting, the foreign ministers discussed international problems and possibilities of and prospects for the development of bilateral cooperation between the Soviet Union and Norway.

The Soviet side noted the stable character of bilateral relations and confirmed its adherence to ensuring security in the north. The sides discussed the ecological situation in the region. Shevardnadze noted the importance of the Norwegian initiative to hold a political dialogue on the problems of the Kola Peninsula.

Shevardnadze confirmed the invitation to the Norwegian foreign minister to visit the Sovet Union.

Talks With Greek Counterpart

LD0210080790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0608 GMT 2 Sep 90

[Excerpt] New York, 2 Oct (TASS)—USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shavardnadze has met with Greek Foreign Minister A. Samaras. The ministers expressed support for the expansion of legal agreements on whose basis the relations between the Soviet Union and Greece should be founded. They both expressed support for the idea of convening an international conference on the problems of the Mediterranean. Questions concerning a Cyprus settlement were examined. [passage omitted]

Soviet, European Parliament Talks Reported

PM0110102590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by special correspondent Ye. Bovkun: "Helsinki Process: New Dimension"]

[Text] Strasbourg—A delegation headed by I.D. Laptev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of the Union, is taking part in the work of the Council of Europe parliamentary assembly in Strasbourg 26 and 27 September.

The first thing I thought when I saw the massive cone-shaped but surprisingly elegant building of the Palace of Europe in Strasbourg, somewhat reminiscent of the architectural lines of Le Corbusier, was: "The parliamentarians already have a common European home."

But it turned out that they do not all have it. The Council of Europe is the oldest intergovernmental organization on the content and has been in existence for over 40 years, and although it unites 23 states it nonetheless does not represent all Europe.

This time the parliamentarians had gathered to discuss a complex but unusually broad and long-term task—that of creating a single parliamentary organ of participants in the all-European conference on security and cooperation.

It is a case of finally imparting a "parliamentary dimension" to the Helsinki process, I.D. Laptev stressed in a talk with me. The Soviet delegation arrived in Strasbourg with the firm intention not only of actively supporting the idea of forming new all-European institutions but also of making its own contribution to its implementation.

The Council of Europe tried to pursue an "Eastern policy" even in the past. In the mid-sixties its then general secretary insisted that the council would be open for cooperation with any country prepared to respect its statute. Talks with the East were broken off after the introduction of Soviet troops into Czechoslovakia. A second attempt was made soon after the signing of the Final Act in Helsinki. But hopes for cooperation were dispelled with the start of the war in Afghanistan. Only the broad democratic transformations in East Europe made possible the implementation of the building of a common home. The "Demosthenes" program elaborated by the Council of Europe envisages in particular rendering aid to the Central and Eastern European countries in preparing constitutional, legislative, and administrative reforms and various forms of practical cooperation between parliamentarians.

The first parliamentary exchange between our country and the Council of Europe began in April 1988. And in June last year the parliamentary assembly had already given the USSR the status of a "special guest," enabling Soviet parliamentarians to take part in sessions of the assembly and the work of its committees, although without the right to vote.

When in July 1989 M.S. Gorbachev visited the "European capital," speaking at a parliamentary assembly session, the Council of Europe was persuaded of the seriousness of the USSR's intentions to supplement the Helsinki process with broad parliamentary cooperation.

Events then developed at almost lightning speed. In May of this year the parliamentary assembly invited countries not belonging to the Council of Europe to take part in dialogue, granting them the right to vote. It was decided that the "parliamentary wing" of the CSCE would be created on the basis of the Parliamentary Assembly. The idea was supported by the foreign ministers of the European countries, and President Bush came out with the initiative for creating a CSCE parliamentary organ. The NATO leaders, who met in London in July, included in the document of their meeting a special recommendation regarding the "institutionalization of the Helsinki process."

There are still 23 members in the Council of Europe, but six states have asked to be admitted to this organization. Seven countries have been granted the status of "special guests." Thus parliamentary cooperation already encompasses 30 CSCE participants. The creation of a permanent parliamentary organ will mean the start of the building of new structures encompassing truly all countries of our continent. Debates in Strasbourg are being conducted on the very threshold of the "common home." The chances of a speedy move into new accommodation are very real.

Lukyanov Receives Pugwash Movement Leaders

LD2709164990 Moscow TASS in English 1642 GMT 27 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS—Soviet Parliament Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov received the following members of the leadership of the International Pugwash Movement of Scientists Against Nuclear Threat in the Kremlin today: President Joseph Rotblat (Britain), General Secretary Francesco Calogero (Italy) and Chairman of the Executive Committee John Holdren (U.S.).

The activities of the International Pugwash Movement of Scientists in the light of the end of the cold war and the main directions of the movement's activities at the present stage were discussed.

The members of the leadership of the Pugwash Movement spoke about the results of the recent 40th Pugwash Conference of Scientists in Britain and shared their impressions of their meeting with the members of the Soviet Parliament's Committee for International Affairs.

Lukyanov told the guests about the activities of the Soviet Parliament, measures which are being taken by it to stabilise the country's economic and socio-political life in view of the transition to an all-Union market and the preparation of a new union treaty, as well as the main aspects of Soviet foreign policy based on new political thinking.

Commentators Reassess UN's Global Role

LD2809165690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 28 Sep 90

["International Situation—Questions and Answers" program, presented by all-Union radio foreign affairs commentator Yevgeniy Grachev, with commentator Valentin Gubernatorov, special correspondent Aleksandr Kuzin, commentator Sergey Pravdin, and foreign affairs section staffer Andrey Trapeznikov]

[Excerpts] [Grachev] Reflecting on your letters that we have been receiving during these autumn days, one finds oneself automatically thinking about the deep roots that perestroyka has put down in our awareness. What yesterday seemed remote and incomprehensible is today becoming the reality that surrounds us. For instance, it is not long since the term pluralism became part of our daily existence, and it is not long since we ceased to detect some unhealthy meaning in this idea, but now pluralism of opinions is not an equivocal thing, it is part of our spiritual life. This is proven by your letters in which even the very same events and the very same facts are assessed differently. [passage omitted]

Isagib Gilatullin from Udmurtia, Valentina Mikhaylovna Voronova from the town of Balashikha in Moscow oblast, and many other listeners ask about the United Nation's role in settling conflicts. I have asked commentator Valentin Gubernatorov to give us his thoughts on the role of the United Nations in settling conflicts. He has studied a great deal the problems of international efforts on the issues of disarmament, security, and trust. If you please, Valentin.

[Gubernatorov] Before answering the specific question I would first like to say a few words about international conflicts in general and the possibilities for settling them. In my view, the world community has already accumulated a certain amount of experience in averting and resolving conflict situations. Moreover, new prerequisites for this have appeared in the world of late. What I mean is that the idea of the possibility of a peaceful solution of all contentious issues, above all by negotiations, now prevails in international relations. This has been helped to a considerable extent by recognition of the uniqueness and pricelessness of each human life. Freeing ourselves from a blinkered and ideological approach towards our definition and assessments of conflict itself, we have easily begun to find ways to mutual understanding with the West.

The case previously was that even quite recently we saw in every conflict first and foremost an exacerbation of class contradictions. However, life has taught us that it is impossible to approach an assessment of conflicts with only this yardstick. There are many more reasons for the emergence of conflicts, including territorial, racial, nationalist, religious and social reasons. Let us take, for instance, the territorial claims of certain states on each other. It is reckoned by Western specialists that over 300 such reciprocal claims exist in the world, and about 100 of them are quite likely to develop into armed clashes. Moreover this is irrespective of the social and state systems of the sides involved in conflict. It is here that the role of the United Nations can be extremely high in averting such conflict situations.

What then to date has prevented this organization from being an effective instrument in resolving contentious issues? It has been above all the absence of unity in the ranks of the world community. However, as soon as we gave up explaining all world processes and events only from class viewpoints and when at last we recognized the priority of common human values over class and group values, this unity emerged.

A graphic example of this has been the joint actions by the five permament members of the UN Security Council with respect to Iraq. The unanimously adopted resolution on an economic blockade of the aggressor has placed Iraq at the present time in an extremely grave situation. If the present Iraqi leadership was sensible enough to give up its invasion and other ambitions, it would definitely avail itself of the opportunity to withdraw its forces from Kuwait and to restore the status quo, as the world community demands. Although it is putting pressure on Iraq, the United Nations is nevertheless leaving it an opportunity to resolve the Persian Gulf conflict by peaceful means.

A further issue acutely faces the international community with respect to the conflict in the Persian Gulf. It is the issue of armaments. It is now clear to us that criteria of sufficiency are essential for defense needs.

The question of the economic consequences of such conflicts is also of great importance. At the present time, for instance, the entire world economic system, in connection with the Persian Gulf conflict has begun to experience a certain amount of energy difficulties and many economic links between various countries have been disrupted. Indeed, it has been noticed that it is above all the developing states that suffer as a result of these conflicts. Once again the Soviet Union, in order to reduce the negative economic consequences of conflicts, has proposed the creation as soon as possible of an international mechanism, albeit a temporary one, for getting out of crisis situations, and the center of actions to eliminate such consequences should again be the United Nations. [passage omitted]

Full Use of UN Military Panel Urged in Gulf

PM2409095590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Sep 90 Second Edition p 4

["Viewpoint" by Political Observer Gennadiy Vasilyev: "On the East River After the 'Cold War'"]

[Text] The "forum of the peoples" is what we often call the United Nations. In so saying we note the worldwide, all-embracing nature of this organization and stress the fact that the voices of delegates from a multitude of countries, near and far, can be heard in the auditoriums of the glass skyscraper on the East River.

For four and a half decades the worldwide organization has fulfilled useful functions, raising important global problems and exerting an ennobling influence on the world community through its moral authority. But when it comes to directly stopping the aggressive actions of one country or another, alas, it has proved ineffectual. The ideologized and confrontational nature of the policies of the East and West and the division of the world into "two camps" had the most pernicious effect on the work of all its organs. In these conditions the activity of an important component of the organization like the Security Council has frequently been paralyzed by a veto from one of the opposing sides.

I thought about all of this when I read reports from New York about the efforts made by the United Nations in connection with the military-political crisis in the Persian Gulf. The Security Council has voted on this question six times in the past six weeks. It condemned Iraq's aggression against Kuwait, demanded the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from the seized territory, introduced trade and economic sanctions against Baghdad, adopted a decision on measures to maintain these sanctions, and finally, agreed on the permissibility of supplying food products to children and old people in Iraq and Kuwait. All five permanent members of the Council, including the Soviet Union, the United States, and the PRC, voted six times in support of these resolutions. What seemed inconceivable even quite recently is becoming commonplace. "With the end of the 'cold war,'" THE NEW YORK TIMES observer Paul Lewis writes, "the United States and the Soviet Union are creating a working alliance in the United Nations which is giving the organization its first real chance in 45 years to function the way it should."

I recall an event of nearly two years ago. Of 7 December 1988. M.S. Gorbachev's speech in the United Nations. The Soviet leader said that, under the onslaught of the "cold war," the organization had turned into a field for propaganda battles and the cultivation of political confrontation immediately after its creation, and this had lasted many years.

Today, despite all the difficulties and the resistance of those who have hitched their fate to a policy of force, these principles are "starting to work," thus helping to improve the whole international atmosphere. A new spirit of cooperation has recently been felt at the UN headquarters. The organization has not only stepped up its efforts in the sphere of global problems, but is also playing an increasingly marked role in settling regional conflicts. Its sphere of concern is by no means restricted to the Persian Gulf. Remember the significant UN contribution to the start of movement toward a peace settlement in Afghanistan, its participation in the holding of elections in Nicaragua, its mediation efforts in El Salvador, and its participation in untying the Cambodian knot.

Mankind is at the very beginning of the path toward a civilized world order. Saddam Husayn has convincingly proved that this path will not be easy or straightforward by "swallowing" little but fabulously wealthy Kuwait in a trice. On the whole, the United Nations has proved equal to the situation, mobilizing the collective efforts of the world community to oppose the aggressor and find a political solution to the crisis. But the restricted nature of its potential for practical opposition to the invader has also emerged. After all, the real shield in the aggressor's path is not the United Nations, but the troops of the United States and a number of countries that have joined it. And to my mind, this is not the best solution to the problem. The massive deployment of the Armed Forces of one of the great powers in a strategically important region is bound to arouse suspicions that aims are being pursued that go beyond the bounds of suppressing aggression. I think that the UN Military Staff Committee—an organ under the Security Council which is called upon to help it to maintain peace, including by implementing strategic leadership of any Armed Forces placed under the Security Council's command—should be fully used. All the world organization's potential must be activated in the favorable new conditions. And then maybe it will be possible to implement the words "To save generations to come from the calamities of war...." enshrined in the charter as a hope for something better and as a solemn promise.

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze, Bush Hold Talks at UN in New York

Talks Begin 1 Oct

LD0110191990 Moscow TASS in English 1902 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Text] United Nations October 1 TASS—U.S. President George Bush and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze have completed their meeting in New York, which lasted about an hour.

Answering reporters' questions after the meeting, Shevardnadze described it as "necessary and very useful".

Bush Stresses End of Cold War

LD0110200590 Moscow TASS in English 1946 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes]

[Text] United Nations October 1 TASS—President George Bush addressed the 45th U.N. General Assembly during the general debate here today, stressing the end of the cold war and the coming of a new era in the world.

"Not since 1945 have we seen the real possibility of using the United Nations as it was designed—as a centre for international collective security," Bush said.

According to the President, changes in the Soviet Union have been critically important for the emergence of a stronger U.N.

"The U.S.-Soviet relationship is finally beyond containment and confrontation, and now we seek to fulfill the promise of mutually shared understanding," he stressed.

"The long twilight struggle that for 45 years has divided Europe, our two nations, and much of the world has to come to and end. We are hopeful that the machinery of the United Nations will no longer be frozen by the divisions that plagued us during the cold war.

"That, at long last, we will be able to build a new world based on an event for which we have all hoped—an end of the cold war."

Dealing with the present situation in the Gulf, Bush said that Iraq's unprovoked aggression is a throw-back to another era, a dark relic from a dark time.

"The U.N. Security Council's resolute response to Iraq's unprovoked aggression has been without precedent. The annexation of Kuwait will not be permitted to stand."

"The United States supports the use of sanctions to compel Iraq's leaders to withdraw immediately and without condition from Kuwait," the President continued.

"We also support the provision of medicine, and of food for humanitarian purposes, so long as distribution can be properly monitored," Bush noted.

"Along with others, we have dispatched military forces to the region to enforce sanctions," he said. "We seek no advantage for ourselves. Nor do we seek to maintain our military forces in Saudi Arabia for one day longer than is necessary.

"Let me also emphasise that all of us here at the U.N. hope military forces will never have to be used. We seek a peaceful outcome—a diplomatic outcome."

Bush expressed opinion that the present aggression in the Gulf is a menace not only to one region's security, but to "the entire world's vision of our future". It threatens to turn the dream of a new international order into a grim nightmare of anarchy.

"As a world community, we must act—not only to deter the use of inhuman weapons like mustard and nerve gas—but to eliminate the weapons entirely," Bush continued.

Bush noted that he had set out a programme to eliminate chemical weapons at the U.N. General Assembly last year. He added that the United States was fulfilling its promises.

In June, the U.S. and the Soviet Union signed a landmark agreement to halt production, and to destroy the vast majority of chemical weapons' stockpiles. Today, U.S. chemical weapons are being destroyed, the President said.

But time is running out. "The Gulf crisis proves how important it is to act together—and to act now—to conclude an absolute, worldwide ban on these weapons.

"We must also redouble our efforts to stem the spread of nuclear weapons, biological weapons, and the ballistic missiles."

"Free elections are the foundation of democratic government, and can produce dramatic success, as we have seen in Namibia and Nicaragua," Bush continued.

He proposed that the United Nations establish a special coordinator for electoral assistance, to be assisted by a U.N. electoral commission comprised of distinguished experts from around the world.

"We have a vision of a new partnership of nations based on consultation, cooperation and collective action, especially through international and regional organisations," the President stressed.

Noting that it is time now to set aside old debates and old controversies, he called for replacing polemic attacks with pragmatic action.

Shevardnadze Interviewed

LD0210004590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2310 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Kochetkov, Yevginiy Menkes, and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] United Nations, 2 Oct (TASS)—The meeting of USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. President George Bush took place on Monday in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel—the New York residence of the U.S. President.

Replying to journalists' questions after the talk, the Soviet minister said:

[Shevardnadze] We examined the most topical problems. It is natural that issues we are discussing with James Baker, secretary of state—arms control as well as preparations for the all-European summit in Paris—were at the center of our attention.

So the Paris summit can be successful, it is necessary to conclude in a positive manner the Vienna talks on reducing conventional arms in Europe. It is possible today to state with satisfaction that it is completely realistic to count on achieving positive results at the Vienna talks. It was one of the main problems we discussed with the President—the preparations for the Paris meeting and ensuring that it is successful. We have also agreed that favorable conditions exist for successfully concluding by the end of this year the talks on strategic offensive weapons. It seems to me that definite results here can be achieved, even during my stay in New York. It will then be perhaps possible to conclude work on a treaty on strategic offensive weapons during my forthcoming visit to the United States at the beginning of November.

Such are the plans. If we succeed in implementing them, we will also be able to determine the time of the U.S. President's visit to Moscow.

We also discussed certain issues of bilateral relations, including our economic cooperation.

In the conversation with the President, I stressed the importance of his speech at the United Nations today, and especially of the clause that discusses U.S. support for the activities and role of the United nations.

Of course, the President and I discussed in detail the conflict in the Persian Gulf. We let it be understood to the U.S. Administration that possibilities for the peaceful settlement of the crisis still exist and we are ready to work together to achieve such a peaceful settlement.

We also talked about the situation in other regions, especially in Central America. In particular, we considered the Salvadorean problem. Of course, it was difficult to consider all problems in the course of a single conversation, but I believe that it was a necessary and good meeting.

I have already said that some aspects of economic cooperation between our countries were discussed. I believe that there are inspiring prospects for this cooperation. During the recent visit to Moscow of Secretary of State James Baker, all these issues, and specific projects, were discussed in detail. The President supports the program for implementing these projects, so things will get moving.

Commentary Views U.S. Impatience on Gulf Crisis

PM0110232790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Nadein: "New Relations Between USSR and United States Determine World Climate. Shevardnadze Answers Questions on U.S. TV Program 'Meet the Press'"]

[Text] Washington—Impatience is mounting in the United States. Analysts are coming to the conclusion that Iraq is coping relatively easily with the blockade. THE WASHINGTON POST has published an article by a correspondent titled "U.S. Force Seems the Only Way Out." In that same Sunday edition the situation in the Near East is analyzed in detail by Henry Kissinger. He holds that the present "stalemate" in the region is not beneficial to the United States for many reasons. And here he does not even cite as figuring among the main reasons the purely financial one, bound up with the major expenditure on maintaining troops in the region.

The following should, in the opinion of this well-known analyst, prompt the United States to the most resolute action in the very near future. First, the longer the present uncertainty persists, the greater the chances of a descent into economic crisis as a result of the recession and inflation provoked by rapidly mounting oil prices. Second, the continuing stalemate increases the domestic instability of America's friends in the Arab world, augmenting the strength of Husayn's supporters. Third, Iraq, which for the first time in recent history has dared to seize hostages on a state level, should not be helped to "save face," for "face-saving" would serve precisely as a reward for aggression. And fourth and finally, U.S. failure would have an inevitable effect upon international stability, threatening the world consensus that is just becoming established.

I have cited just two articles. However, to complete the impression it is necessary to bear in mind that these notes of impatience and regret about the campaign being lost without a shot being fired are sounded in large numbers by various sides. It would be an unpardonable simplification to think that such feelings are groundless and that they are dictated purely by the interests of the oil monopolies or the geopolitical self-interest of Pentagon strategists. The situation in the Persian Gulf truly requires, as a CNN commentator put it, the patience of the devil, which has got nothing at all to do with the indecisiveness of an angel.

Given this complex situation, many people in the United States awaited with understandable impatience the broadcast of a preannounced television interview with USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze, who is taking part in the UN session.

"If the United States takes unilateral military action, will the USSR support it?"—That is how the key question was worded.

"I would not like to answer that question," the minister said, and continued: "The consequences of a military conflict are still difficult to predict. The fact that it will visit enormous misfortune upon the population of the region, that is natural; however, by all appearances, it will not be limited to the region. And therefore hasty decisions should be avoided and we should do everything possible to ensure that UN Security Council resolutions are implemented by peaceful means."

Particular attention was paid to the role of the United Nations. The Soviet minister said that the USSR will unconditionally fulfill the UN decisions even if involves the need to use Soviet military force.

"But what about the Soviet military advisers in Iraq?" U.S. journalists immediately asked. In so doing they did not mention but seemed to have in mind the view quite widespread in the United States that by keeping its military in Iraq, the USSR is somehow holding the United States back from launching strikes against the aggressor.

In his reply, Shevardnadze changed the timeframe somewhat. He recalled that treaty-based friendly relations have existed between the Soviet Union and Iraq since 1972. Until recently, there were over 10,000 of our specialists in that Arab country, quite a few of them military.

In passing, the minister also explained the discrepancies regarding the number of military specialists left behind. M.S. Gorbachev, as is well known, has cited a figure close to 50. The U.S. press has been mentioning a different figure—150. In Shevardnadze's opinion, they are both right, but one point must be clarified: More than half the Soviet specialists remaining there are interpreters.

Commentators put the question more forcefully: Does the aggression not make it an urgent necessity for the Soviet Union to change its attitude toward Iraq? I shall cite one phrase from Shevardnadze's reply: "It does not take much intelligence to break off relations." Replying to the question of whether the United Nations should change in view of the unprecedented changes in the world, he said that the conditions for this international organization's work have become considerably more favorable but there is no need to change the charter.

The minister rejected the possibility of a military coup in the USSR. He paid tribute to B. Yeltsin as a powerful politician, but to the question "If there were elections in the USSR today, who would win—Gorbachev or Yeltsin?" he replied after a few introductory words ("I do not like guessing") quite unambiguously: Gorbachev.

Shevardnadze confirmed the considerable rapprochement between the two superpowers' positions on a very wide range of questions and agreed with the opinion on the similarity of the two presidents' "new thinking," but rejected the suggestion that in the warmer climate of Soviet-U.S. relations the problem of reducing conventional and nuclear missile arms has become of secondary importance.

U.S. General Powell Meets Moiseyev on Military

LD0110195290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1744 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS special correspondent Stanislav Lunev and Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Washington, 1 Oct (TASS)—The official visit to the United States of Army General Mikhail A. Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and first deputy minister of defense of the USSR, began today with a full military salute on the Pentagon lawn.

Talks began between Army General Moiseyev and General Colin Powell, chairman of the U.S. Armed Forces Joint Chiefs of Staff. During the meeting, the plan for contacts between the USSR and U.S. Armed Forces in 1989-1990 was assessed highly. The new plan for 1991-1992 was discussed and agreed. Moiseyev acquainted the Americans with the course of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and with the participation of the Soviet Armed Forces in this process.

Army General Moiseyev stressed that a deep transformation is taking place in the Warsaw Pact aimed at imparting to it the character of a consultative political organization, and at implementing military reform in the USSR. In particular, Soviet military expenditure is being reduced considerably. It is intended to reduce defense allocations in 1990-1991 by 10,000 million rubles, or 14 percent. The saving on defense in the approved five-year plan will run almost 30,000 million rubles, or around 40 percent of the Soviet Union's annual military budget.

Army General Moiseyev noted that a major cut in the USSR Armed Forces by 500,000 men is being effected. Before the end of the current year the Soviet Union will cut on the territory of the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland, 60 tactical rocket launchers and take out of this zone over 1,500 nuclear warheads. The USSR plans to cut in the European region by the end of the year 140 tactical rocket launchers and 3,200 nuclear artillery guns. The entire structure of the Soviet Armed Forces is being transformed; the number of military districts, of armies, and divisions is being cut; and offensive and defensive weapons are being shifted in favor of the latter. The defense of the country is being organized within the limits of the national borders of the USSR.

On Monday [30 September] there was a meeting between Army General Moiseyev and U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney, members of the U.S. Armed Forces Joint Chiefs of Staff, Antony Principi, deputy secretary of veterans' affairs and the chairman and members of the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee. Moiseyev laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery.

China

Signing of Border Protocol With China Planned

LD0110193190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Report by correspondent V. Kovalchuk; from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Only a few hundred meters of the Amur separate the Blagoveshchensk embankment from the Chinese town of Heihe, which is opposite it. Meanwhile, not the best page in the history of relations between the two countries is still making itself felt here, first and foremost in the limiting of the independence of the border services in taking decisions, in the coordination of efforts and in cooperation in guarding the border. So Soviet and Chinese tourists must, for the time being, face additional formalities. And some, it would seem, the most trivial issues, concerning economic links, are still being settled in Moscow or in Beijing.

[V.D. Butenko, chief of troops of the Far East district] Our main aim is to sign a protocol, a protocol between the main representatives of the Heilongjiang Province and the Far East Border District. The aim of these signings is that we should understand one another, that the development of our economies, border trade, tourism, and our sporting and cultural cooperation should be aided.

Commentary Praises Relations With China

OW3009035190 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 29 Sep 90

[Commentary by Nikolayev]

[Text] The Soviet Union and China are neighbors, and neighbors should get along in peace and harmony. Any differences, especially disputes of a large magnitude, will bring hardship to both sides. Moreover, they will also affect other countries. In this sense, relations between the Soviet Union and China have been no exception, leaving us a rich legacy of different significance.

Soviet-Chinese relations continue to develop following their complete normalization. Marked achievements were scored in a short time since the complete normalization of relations. The renovated Soviet-Chinese mutual ties withstood the test. Equality, mutual respect, and mutual benefit are the inherent characteristics of Soviet-Chinese relations. Moreover, these inherent qualities are maintained despite the occurrence of complex, and sometimes painful, processes in our country or China. In the past, this would provide a good opportunity for the opposing side. Needless to say, I am not thrilled by this, but I just want to point out the great changes that have taken place in Soviet-Chinese relations. We, or the Chinese people, have no more reason to share the responsibility for extra funds to build military works on the common border areas of the two countries. Both sides have vigorously sought to make Soviet-Chinese borders into zones of peace. Both sides are engaged in negotiations on the mutual deduction of Armed Forces and on strengthening mutual trust in the military field. This is important not only to the Soviet Union and China, but also to the entire Asian-Pacific region. Is it necessary to prove this point? I can proudly say that the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations has propelled the development of many good things in the Asian-Pacific region. Some countries, which were suspicious of each other not long ago, are now establishing normal, good-neighborly relations. The Indochinese countries and Thailand, as well as other members of ASEAN, are in the process of establishing these relations. The restoration of relations between China and the Indochinese countries has become an important event, greatly propelling the process of the settlement of the Cambodian issue. This is due to the coordination between the Soviet Union and China.

People in Moscow and Beijing welcomed the improvement in the relations between North Korea and South Korea. Of course, I have no intention of attributing all the favorable changes that happened in the Asian-Pacific region to the normalization of the Soviet-Chinese relations. Contributions by other countries are also indisputable. But the fact that the factors of peace and stability come from Soviet-Chinese relations cannot be doubted.

I think the entire world will be convinced that cooperation and coordination between the Soviet Union and China will have a favorable effect on world affairs.

Chinese, Taiwanese Relations Examined

OW2909112490 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 21 Sep 90

[From the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Dear listeners, IZVESTIYA published a report on China's reunification by its reporter, (Savinkov), in Beijing.

He wrote: The Hong Kong newspaper WEN WEI PO doubts the suitability of the German model for China's reunification. The newspaper first points out that East and West Germany are two independent countries. Second, foreign powers must participate in the process of German reunification. Third, according to the paper's commentator, German reunification is based on West

Germany's economic strength and social system. All these factors are not applicable to China.

Here I wish to point out the essence of Beijing's policy toward Taiwan. The PRC Government is the only legitimate government representing all the people in China, and Taiwan province is an inalienable part of China. Several years ago, Beijing proposed a formula for reunification, namely, "one country, two systems," whereby Taiwan would enjoy extensive autonomy, and keep its own social and economic systems, political structure, way of life, independence in foreign economic relations, and even its own Armed Forces.

The Taiwan authorities' stance toward the mainland is conflicting. For example, Hong Kong's SOUTH CHINA MORNING POST reported that the Kuomintang Discipline Committee decided to allow members of the Kuomintang Central Committee, excluding the 30-member Central Standing Committee, to visit the mainland. A senior Taiwan leader did not even rule out the possibility of RENMIN RIBAO, the CPC Central Committee's organ, establishing a bureau in Taipei if Taiwan papers also are allowed to open bureaus on the mainland.

Taiwan Government officials are concerned with Taiwan investment in the mainland, especially in light of the heavy investment in the mainland in the first half of this year. Will it adversely affect the island's economy?

Taiwan President Li Teng-hui explicitly urged businessmen to stay cool when speaking at the end of July about this investment fever. Now this investment fever has cooled down a bit. However, the results of the fever are remarkable. More than 1,000 Taiwan-funded projects worth $1 billion already have been approved.

Many Taiwan companies are finding it difficult to operate with the constantly rising land prices and labor costs. Moreover, Taiwan has recently approved a strict protectionist law. As a result, some people are now considering moving their factories off the island, and many think that mainland China is the most suitable substitute.

Vietnamese Official's Visit to PRC Eyed

OW2909054890 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Commentary by Mikhaylov from the "World Today" program]

[Text] Dear listners, Li Peng, premier of the Chinese State Council, met in Beijing with Vo Nguyen Giap, vice chairman of the Vietnamese Council of Ministers, who had come to attend the opening ceremony of the 11th Asian Games as a distinguished guest. Our station observer Mikhaylov has the following comments on this:

Even though Vo Nguyen Giap is a guest of the Asian Games rather than an official representative of the Vietnamese Government, observers have unanimously pointed out the great political significance of his current visit. It is the first official visit to Beijing by a Vietnamese statesman at such a high level in 13 years.

As everyone knows, these two previously friendly countries strained their relations in 1979 mainly because of the Cambodian issue. This later became a bloody border clash, and all contacts discontinued accordingly. During the ensuing 10 years, China and Vietnam were constantly in an antagonistic state resulting in added instability in the region. Not until after Vietnamese Vice Foreign Minister Dinh Nho Liem visited Beijing early last year did the two countries resume official contacts. Since then, vice foreign ministers of the two countries have held four meetings. In the past year, both Beijing and Hanoi repeatedly expressed a desire to normalize their relations. On the road to normalization, however, they continuously have met with the obstacle of the Cambodian issue. On several occasions, the Chinese side has proclaimed that it will normalize its relations with Vietnam only after the Cambodiam issue is resolved fairly and entirely.

It seems to me that the positions of the two countries on the Cambodian issue recently has coincided to some degree. For example, the Vietnamese side has commented positively on the PRC's announcement that it will not support the ruling position of the Khmer Rouge in the country and intends to discontinue assistance to this opposition faction. Hanoi supports the decision on the Cambodian issue adopted by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, while China participated in drafting the decision. Recent progress in mediating the Cambodian conflict has created an entirely realistic prerequisite to the normalization of Sino-Vietnamese relations. Perhaps this explains why diplomatic activities have become active in relations between two countries and why speeches of officials have become rather optimistic. For instance, Gu Mu, vice chairman of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference made the following remark when meeting with Vo Nguyen Giap in Beijing: The visit by the vice chairman of the Vietnamese Council of Ministers signals the ending of the decade-long abnormal relations between the two neighboring countries. In talks with Chinese officials in Beijing, Vo Nguyen Giap said that the dark clouds blotting Vietnamese-Chinese relations during the past 10 years are bound to disappear, and the wish to normalize their relations expressed by the two sides during his visit has raised the hope that this will become a reality in the not-too-distant future.

Northeast Asia

Shevardnadze, ROK Counterpart Meet in U.S.

Progress in Ties Seen

LD0110134690 Moscow TASS in English 1330 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS political news analyst Gennadiy Petrov]

[Text] Moscow October 1 TASS—The decision of the Soviet Union and South Korea to establish diplomatic relations is a result of East-West detente and the establishment of a dialogue between the two Korean states.

This decision was spurred on by two important events: The Irkutsk meeting of foreign ministers of the USSR and the U.S. and the first ever talks between the prime ministers of the two Koreas held in early September in Seoul.

A considerable role was played also by successfully developing Soviet-South Korean economic ties. Therefore the signing in New York of the document on diplomatic relations by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his Korean counterpart Choe Ho-jung was not unexpected. The striving of the two countries' governments not to put off the official beginning of bilateral relations until January 1 is quite understandable.

The development of good relations between the USSR and South Korea suits the interests of the peoples of the two countries and will not damage third countries.

Answering questions from reporters in New York, Shevardnadze said that relations between the two countries do not contradict the interests of other countries. Describing the unification of the two Koreas as natural, Shevardnadze said he would promote it.

The Soviet Union is known to favour the demilitarisation of the Korean peninsula, the creation of a united centralised democratic Korean state, as well as the proposals from North Korea towards this.

In short, the Soviet Union's partnership with both sides in the dialogue can only promote progress in achieving the important goal—interaction, the overcoming of the conflict and the wish to promote an improvement in the Asia-Pacific region as a whole.

Discuss Regional Issues

LD0110212690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Report on interview with USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and ROK Foreign Minister Choe Ho-chung; from the "Vremya" newscast; Choe Ho-chung's comments in Korean fading into Russian translation—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Last Sunday [30 September] looked anything but an ordinary weekend with few people around at the UN headquarters in New York. [passage omitted]

The same day Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, continued his consultations with other delegations which had arrived at the UN General Assembly session. The meeting between Comrade Shevardnadze and Choe Ho-chung, minister of foreign affairs of the Republic of Korea, which took place at the UN building, aroused great interest among the international press. Furthering the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and South Korean President No Tae-u, which took place in San Francisco early last summer, the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the Republic of Korea at the level of ambassadors from 30 September was announced in New York.

[Begin Shevardnadze recording] I think this is an extraordinary event. This is a serious event. You are aware of our interests in the Asian-Pacific region. I do not want to say that these are some narrow national interests. We are interested in ensuring stability and peace and security in that very large region. It seems to me that it would not be serious to speak seriously about the principles of security, about forming the structures of security and ensuring stability without taking into account the South Korean factor. [end recording]

[Begin Choe recording] We are convinced that this step will be a serious contribution to strengthening peace and stability on the Korean peninsula and, thereby, will support our striving toward the unification of the Korean nation. And this, in turn, will assist the security and prosperity of Northeast Asia as a whole. [end recording]

[Announcer] The same day after Comrade Shevardnadze met with Levi, Israel's minister of foreign affairs, an accord on the opening of consulates general in the USSR and Israel was announced.

And yet another important event: Diplomatic relations between our country and Honduras have been established at the level of ambassadors.

Now, as you are watching this program, a two-day meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs of the CSCE member-states is opening in New York.

Ties Said To Pose No Danger

OW0210101590 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 29 Sep 90

[Commentary by (Shchidrov)]

[Text] Soviet-ROK foreign ministerial talks are scheduled for 30 September in New York. Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and ROK Foreign Minister Choe Ho-chung are already in New York to attend a UN General Assembly session. This will be the first foreign ministerial talks between the two countries. At present, the Soviet Union and the ROK maintain no diplomatic relations. Last June, Soviet President Gorbachev and ROK President No Tae-u held talks in San Francisco, and in August the ROK sent its first government delegation to Moscow.

Moscow Radio commentator (Shchidrov) has the following comment:

It is easy to anticipate that a rough blueprint for the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK will be decided at the first foreign ministers' talks in New York. But is this development being received calmly by everyone? The answer is not necessarily yes. Particularly wary is the DPRK.

The outcome of Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's talks in Pyongyang in September has recently been made public. According to a report by MINJU CHOSON, a Pyongyang newspaper, a six-item memorandum was given to Foreign Minister Shevardnadze at the talks. The memorandum states that the planned establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK is an undisguisedly hostile act.

Similar criticism also is being aimed at the Soviet Union from radical student organizations in the ROK. Leaders of student organizations declare that they will burn Soviet flags in public if and when diplomatic relations are established.

Regarding these reactions to the friendly overtures between the Soviet Union and the ROK, I want to quote Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, who said that the Soviet Union is a sovereign state that can decide, on its own, which countries it wants to have relations with.

The North Korean memorandum contains a passage which states that the Soviet Union is helping to perpetuate the split of Korea by establishing diplomatic relations with the ROK. Is this really true?

The cherished desire for the reunification of North and South Korea depends on the results of dialogue which has been opened between the sides. However, reality shows that the dialogue at present is very unstable and that neither side recognizes the other. On top of that, old grudges and distrust are bearing heavily on the talks.

One of the props supporting this dialogue lest it fail is energetic world support for the reconciliation between North and South Korea. Because of this support, good relations can be developed.

The United States has already proposed the restoration of relations with North Korea. The Soviet Union is holding talks with the ROK on the establishment of embassies in each country. Only the prejudiced see something unnatural or sense danger in this development.

Reports, Comments Assess Relations With ROK

International Talks in Seoul Eyed

SK2909115190 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 22 Sep 90

[Report on interview with Aleksandr Voronsov, researcher at the Oriental Studies Institute under the Soviet Academy of Sciences, from the "Focus on Asia" program; Voronosov's comments are in Korean with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] The multifaceted ties between the Soviet Union and the ROK lately have markedly expanded. This trend also is evident in contacts between the representatives of the two countries' scientific circles. A series of international meetings were held a while ago in Seoul. Soviet scholars also attended these meetings. Aleksandr Voronsov, a researcher at the Oriental Studies Institute under the Soviet Academy of Sciences, said:

[Begin Voronsov recording] I attended two meetings in Seoul. One of them was a meeting on [word indistinct] for peace that was held under the auspices of the ROK Academy of Sciences. The meeting was entitled: Establishment of a New Global Order and Prospects of Reforms in Asia.

Approximately 60 scholars from 15 countries attended the meeting. They included influential scholars from the United States, the FRG, Japan, China, and the Soviet Union. Soviet scholars attended this meeting for the first time. All participants focused on a need to maintain peace. Despite their diverse views on international issues, the participants in the meeting unanimously and highly rated the Soviet Union's constructive new policies. This included not only its policies toward Asia, but also its worldwide policies.

The participants pointed out that these policies are a major factor in helping to stabilize Asia and normalize the Korean peninsula. The meeting was held in the context of overall world changes, and, first of all, revolutionary changes in the socialist countries. For example, it was raised whether experiences from the German unification can be used in solving the Korean question.

The second meeting I attended was the 19th international meeting organized by the ROK International Affairs Institute. The meeting included a roundtable meeting and a separate meeting to discuss stability and reforms in Northeast Asia. Representatives from influential universities and academic institutes from many countries attended this meeting in Seoul. The Soviet Union was represented by scholars from three academic institutes—the Party Scientific Institute [as heard], the World Economics and International Relations Institute, and the Far East Institute.

Many of the participants said the overall global structure, established as a result of the Yalta conference in 1945, [words indistinct]. Also, we are witnessing today the establishment of a fundamentally new international structure. There were interesting discussions on this topic. Not all the Soviet scholars shared the same view. Some of them insisted the Treaty of Yalta, which envisaged promoting peace and cooperation among countries that had different social structures, sowed the seeds of a system based on new ideas. It is a different matter that, because of a series of objective and subjective reasons, this was not fruitful. [Words indistinct], confrontation, which is a far cry from the ideals of Yalta, took place.

The ROK's leading politicians and businessmen were greatly interested in this meeting. During and after the meeting, the Soviet participants [words indistinct] ROK Foreign Minister Choe Ho-chung; Chong Chu-yong, honorary chairman of the Hyundai Group; and some of the ROK business leaders who were interested in events in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and the prospects of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the ROK. These business leaders paid great attention to the Soviet Union's influence on normalizing the international situation and, first of all, the situation on the Korean peninsula. Mikhail Kapitsa, head of the Soviet delegation, candidate academician of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and director of the academy's Oriental Studies Institute, pointed out that constructive North-South dialogue can be held only when the two sides wholeheartedly respect each other. [end recording]

Soviet Official Views Ties

SK0110042490 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 27 Sep 90

[From the "Asian News" program within the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] According to a reporter from the MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, a responsible functionary at the Soviet Foreign Ministry, who did not want to be identified, neither confirmed nor denied the recent reports from Western news agencies that official relations between Moscow and Seoul will be established in November. The responsible functionary said that this matter will be discussed at the talks between foreign ministers of the ROK and the Soviet Union which will be held soon in New York. He said that diplomatic relations between the two countries will be established without fail. What has not been determined yet is when the diplomatic relations will be established.

In response to a reporter's question that "won't such an approach between Moscow and Seoul result in severing the existing official ties with the DPRK?" the responsible functionary at the Soviet Foreign Ministry said that the new road of relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK will not inflict a loss on any third countries, including the DPRK. He also said that the normalization of relations between Moscow and Seoul will have an affirmative effect on the current dialogue for peace between North and South Korea.

ROK Diplomat Welcomes Relations

LD0110213790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1523 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Polovko]

[Text] Moscow 1 Oct (TASS)—"The decision to establish diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Korea is a logical consequence of a purposeful process of bilateral rapproachment, which was begun at the San Francisco meeting of the presidents of the two countries in June this year," said So Hyon-sop [consular official] of the Embassy of the Republic of Korea in Moscow, in an interview to a TASS correspondent today.

Speaking about the significance of the establishment of diplomatic relations for the future development of ties, primarily in the economic sphere, So Hyon-sop noted, that "it is highly unlikely that there could be two other countries in the world which would have such an enormous potential for mutually beneficial co-operation." Already now, he says, "economic ties are developing quite swiftly. The volume of commodity trade between the two countries in 1989 was $600 million. This year it will approach one billion." Complete normalization of relations between the USSR and the Republic of Korea, in the opinion of the South Korean diplomat, will be "important impetus in stepping up bilateral ties in trade and economy, science, culture, and others."

Mutual Soviet-Korean diplomatic recognition will have a "beneficial influence on an inter-Korean dialogue," So Hyon-sop believes. In his opinion such a step by the Soviet Union and South Korea toward each other "will be an impetus for China in examining the question of establishing diplomatic relations with the Republic of Korea in a practical way." "Eventually all of this will facilitate stabilization of the situation both on the Korean peninsula and in the Asian-Pacific region in general," he said.

DPRK Opposition Noted

LD0110222390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Report by correspondent M. Osokin; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The reported establishment of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Seoul has evoked great interest throughout the world. Both sides have been moving toward this goal for a long time. South Korean representatives have made a series of visits to Moscow and many economic agreements have been concluded. As regards political aspects, South Korean newspapers have already reported President No Tae-u's desire to visit the USSR before January and on a plan to invite Mikhail Gorbachev to Seoul early next year.

With no lesser interest observers are analyzing signals that come from here, from the north of Korea. Shevardnadze visited Pyongyang early in the month and said that the talks were very complex.

IZVESTIYA, quoting a spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, wrote that our position can be formulated in the following way: We are a sovereign state and determine our foreign policy independently, including the issue of establishing relations. Pyongyang's position became clear from the memorandum of the DPRK foreign minister which was published last week. It contained sharp pronouncements against the development of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Seoul as a factor contributing to the preservation of the division of the peninsula into two Koreas and preventing unification. Also, the memorandum contained the following theme: all this will turn the Pyongyang-Moscow treaty into a nominal one and then the DPRK will have to take measures for manufacturing certain kinds of weapons using its own reserves.

Speaking about weapons, one cannot fail to mention the Geneva international conference in August on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. According to newspaper reports, (Ben Sanders), secretary general of the previous conference, mentioned Pyongyang's nuclear allegations. The memorandum published in Pyongyang stressed another problem: it appears that the arms race on the peninsula will unavoidably gain strength now.

And, finally, yet another forecast in the memorandum is of interest alleging that, eventually, the South Korean authorities will become more arrogant and will try to engulf the North following the pattern of German unification.

Reports Provoke Irritation

PM0110130790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by V. Lukashin under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Correspondents on World Events": "Strange Article in DPRK Government Newspaper. Incomprehensible and Discourteous"]

[Text] Pyongyang—On 11 September IZVESTIYA (No. 255) published a correspondent M. Yusin piece, "Seoul and Moscow Ready To Establish Diplomatic Relations?"

Its author, incidentally, also wrote that reports appeared in the foreign press that diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea might be established in the near future.

Unfortunately, the IZVESTIYA piece provoked extreme irritation in Pyongyang. On 19 September the government newspaper MINJU CHOSON printed a commentary, "Actions Preventing Korea's Unification," in which a whole series of claims was leveled in harsh tones not only at IZVESTIYA, but also at our country. In particular the following was said: "The Soviet IZVESTIYA newspaper, giving its own appreciation of the talks between the DPRK and USSR foreign ministers in Pyongyang, printed an article in the last few days which notes that the Soviet Union will establish 'diplomatic relations' with South Korea. If the Soviet Union establishes 'diplomatic relations' with South Korea, this will signify that it will join the attempts to create 'two Koreas,' which will lead to an increase in our people's sufferings and misfortunes because of a split in the nation. However, IZVESTIYA writes that it is being done in the Soviet Union's interests and is a question 'which must be decided by the USSR itself—a sovereign state—without anybody's permission.' Such a position reveals the idea that one can encroach on the interests of a foreign country, another nation, even an ally, in one's own interests."

And further on the graphic, though not entirely courteous, assessment is given: "The IZVESTIYA article is of a disgusting nature...."

We do not intend to enter into polemics with the Korean journalist. Let all the problems and the claims he has put forward be discussed by diplomats. But there are also those aspects of principle in the MINJU CHOSON commentary which the DPRK Government newspaper author was still bound to know about. We are primarily referring to the claim that the Soviet Union is, allegedly, responsible for Korea's partition after World War II.

We have no wish to, but evidently there is still the need to recall the words of Kim Il-song: "The heroic Red Army, by expelling the Japanese imperialists, has brought freedom and independence to the Korean people. The road to a bright future has opened up before the Korean people." It is a great pity that the government newspaper contributor has no knowledge of this pronouncement by his president.

The commentary's author also forgot another thing. All the past years that the Soviet Union has actively supported DPRK Government initiatives aimed at turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, and also the Korean people's struggle for peaceful unification of their homeland. By the way, our newspaper has likewise repeatedly come out in support of Pyongyang's initiatives.

The IZVESTIYA collective has long supported creative and friendly contacts with MINJU CHOSON journalists, about which this newspaper has written in its columns. So just what provoked such a strange and, bluntly speaking, discourteous reaction from the DPRK Government newspaper? For the moment it all remains a complete mystery.

Near East & South Asia

Saddam's Televised Statement on Gulf Viewed

LD0110155590 Moscow TASS in English 1543 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov]

[Text] Moscow October 1 TASS—President Saddam Husayn of Iraq in a televised statement has proposed giving up the "language of threats" in favour of a "serious dialogue" to settle the Gulf crisis.

However, Saddam said there could be no return to the situation that existed before August 2, the day Iraqi troops marched into Kuwait.

The United Nations Security Council and the rest of the international community have made their positions explicitly clear. They describe the invasion of Kuwait as unacceptable and inadmissable and urge Baghdad to withdraw unconditionally and immediately and to restore its sovereignty.

The international community also called upon Iraq to release all hostages and ensure the immunity of foreign diplomats in Kuwait.

The United Nations said the conflict could not be resolved if these demands were not met.

Characteristically, Saddam made his "new initiative" amid the build-up of Iraqi Armed Forces on the border with Saudi Arabia, its incessant threats to "make a large fire" in the Middle East by using weapons of mass destruction, and the seizure of foreign embassies in Kuwait.

All these moves, aiming to heighten tension in the region, and Saddam's stand on Kuwait prompt the conclusion that his call for dialogue is only a tactical manoeuvre intended to weaken the determination of the international community to implement UN Security Council sanctions.

Saddam claimed in his statement that Iraq was maintaining "special contacts" with France.

This claim was immediately denied by the French Foreign Ministry. An official said Saddam's call for dialogue did not contain any new elements that could help normalise the situation in the region.

French newspapers described Saddam's statement as an "attempt to provoke disagreement between UN members."

Soviet 'Specialists' Seek Departure From Iraq

90UF0585A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 39, 29 Sep-5 Oct 90 p 5

[Report by N. Soldatenkov and letter to RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies from Soviet "specialists" in Iraq: "Our People in Iraq"]

[Text] A person came to the ARGUMENTY I FAKTY editorial office and handed in a letter which his comrades—specialists working on the construction of a civilian project in southern Iraq—requested be passed on to the Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] (it is carried below).

That these people have faith in and are appealing for help not to the Union but the republic government is a fact which speaks in the latter's favor. But this does not in the least absolve the former of responsibility. And we hope that all on whom the fate of these people depends will read this letter. And not only read it but also adopt the necessary rescue measures—yes, the saving of the lives of their fellow citizens who have found themselves practically hostages of the Husayn regime. After all, according to the person who visited the editorial office and who wishes to remain anonymous, the situation there is now heating up with every passing day.

There are approximately 300 Soviet workers at the project, there is sufficient food for just a few days, and at the market and in the stores the Iraqis are refusing to serve Russians. People are driving 270 km to obtain a bucket per day of what after several resourceful operations becomes something reminiscent of water.

But this is not all. The life of Soviet workers is in real jeopardy. Fifteen-year-old Iraqi boys, to whom the Iraqi military has issued AK-47 assault rifles, have thought up an original method of playing games—they are increasingly training the barrels on our workers. One of these "jokers" recently sprayed an "ambulance" and a concrete mixer. The driver of the "ambulance" was hit by an explosive bullet in the leg and had to have it amputated.

When the military operations began, the women, the sick, and children were sent from this project back to the Union. As is usually the case in such situations, the first to hastily leave the danger zone were the bosses and the party organizer, who did not, incidentally, forget to first collect the party dues.

But those who are "more ordinary" were left to complete the project. No requests to the Soviet Consulate to arrange departure for the motherland produced any results. A strike which was initiated ended in failure—the strikers were simply paid no money. Meanwhile all the Czechs, who had been working alongside, left long since, refusing to do anything in such conditions. The only recourse of our fellow citizens, however, it would seem, is the traditional one of writing letters.

Help Us Leave!

The Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR from specialists working on contract 24400 (well-head development of oil deposits of the North Rumaila region):

In connection with the deteriorating situation in Iraq, which is a threat to our safety, an outfit numbering more than 300 persons applied to the administration of the Ministry of Construction in the Southern Regions of the USSR Student Mechanized Detachment requesting exit papers for the USSR. But not one person has received authorization for this in the August-September period. We request that you look into this situation and help us return to the motherland.

[Dated] 4 September 1990

On behalf of the outfit—48 signatures

Iraq Expels Iranian Opposition Group

NC0110185990 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] The Baghdad regime has decided to remove the leaders and members of the Iranian opposition organization the Mojahedin-e Khalq Organization from its territory. This decision was made shortly after Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq 'Aziz's recent visit to Tehran.

Throughout the Mojahedin-e's stay on Iraqi soil, official Iranian propaganda described the group's members as the (?real) mercenaries of the Iraqi regime. This is because Iran considered the Mojahedin-e to be a group of traitors, terrorists, and (?mercenaries). However, it now seems that things are not that simple.

The Resistance Army pulled the other members of the Mojahedin-e toward Iraq and they then had no way out. After the Iranian fundamentalists took the monopoly on power into their hands, the regime embarked on a campaign to repress different schools of thought through propaganda, persecution, investigations, arrests and imprisonment, and resort to force. This created a total suppression of activities by opposition groups [word indistinct] in the country.

The Mojahedin-e Khalq Organization was among the first organizations to bear the brunt of the government apparatus' repression. The ruling officials justified their efforts to crush the Mojahedin-e on the grounds of the Mojahedin-e's imaginary opposition to Islam, but this was merely a pretext leveled against the group. The ideological foundation of the Mojahedin-e is Islam, which is also the basis of the restructuring of Iranian society.

The harassment of the Mojahedin-e on the pretext of their apostasy paved the way for the complete ban on this organization. The Tudeh Organization, the Feda'iyan-e Khalq-Majority Group, and other progressive and dissident schools of thought also met the same fate. In such conditions, the Mojahedin-e Khalq Organization chose the course of armed struggle against the regime, but this did not yield any success. The forces of the government and the opposition were glaringly unequal. The organization then moved its headquarters to Paris, and subsequently received permission from Baghdad to establish a base for its armed groups on Iraqi territory.

It is evident that Baghdad wanted to achieve its own objectives when it granted this permission. It viewed the Mojahedin-e Khalq Organization as an instrument to wear down its enemy in the war—that is Iran. Iran also capitalized on the Iraqi opposition to attain its own objectives. Tehran established the Supreme Assembly of the Islamic Revolution in Iraq which was comprised of leading Shiite clerics opposed to Iraq on Iranian territory. Iraqi POWs were also incorporated—following a briefing in the relevant ideology—and were absorbed into armed groups which were then dispatched against Iraq.

For one government to allow its territory to be used as a base by a group opposing another government cannot be considered a normal or usual act, especially at a time when the idea of a policy of obliterating ideologies in a world free from force is (?gaining ground) considerably.

Now that Iran and Iraq have earnestly decided to take steps on the path of peace and goodneighborliness, the use of the opposition forces of the two countries should become unnecessary and be eliminated. It is true that conciliation between the two countries which will work to the detriment of democracy cannot please the Iranians and Iraqis. The curtailing of the opposition's activities on alien soil cannot be considered, even now, the complete (?destruction) of the opposition's existence.

It is likely that in the liberalization of the Iranian regime, in the light of the developments in Iraq, the opposition will seek new forms for its activity, even if they are covert. A government cannot be considered healthy when it bans the activities of the opposition from the social and moral point of view. It can be said that Iranians are right to believe that an era of historic reconciliation has dawned. The time has now come for the opposition and the government to emerge from conditions of irreconcilability and confrontation and make democracy the way of life for Iranian society.

Solutions for Situation in Afghanistan Offered

LD0110201490 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS political observer Yuriy Tyssovskiy]

[Text] Moscow October 1 TASS—The coverage of the situation in Afghanistan by world news agencies is usually monotonously uniform.

Impartial reports reaturing the bombardment of Kabul by rebels can lead one to overlook the tragedies and sorrows of individuals, innocent victims of the political game played by the leaders of Afghan opposition parties in Peshawar.

About 40 civilians, including women and children, died in missile attacks on Kabul over the weekend, Western news agencies reported.

The opposition leadership has been launching attacks on the city's residential areas with U.S. and Arab-made missiles for more than three years.

The goal of these cruel actions is to shake people's belief in the government's stability and prepare the ground for a coup.

The last three years, including 18 months after the Soviet pullout from the country, have shown that the plans of opposition leaders have proved untenable.

Nevertheless, the "missile war" remains the main, if not the only, trump card of the rebel leaders, and the nature of this trump card is becoming more political than military.

The rebel leaders apparently believe that the international media reaction to the missile attacks on Kabul confirms their "presence" in the country as a military force that should be reckoned with.

The results of the current "combat season" are unsatisfactory for the rebels, who have largely failed to achieve their goals.

In addition, the number of their supporters on Capitol Hill is fading. U.S. newspapers more and more often question the expediency of sending weapons and money to rebel leaders.

The positions of the Soviet Union and the United States on the Afghan issue are growing closer, too. Although this rapport has not taken concrete forms as yet, the Cambodian experience shows that such a turn in the solution of the Afghan problem should not be ruled out.

The reliance of the rebel leaders on a military solution of the problem meets with the growing opposition inside Afghanistan and in the rest of the world.

The adherence of rebel leaders to the power policy is quite understandable. War gives them political prestige, armaments, the possibility of producing heroin, and huge financial injections from still-numerous "well-wishers".

The latter include U.S. legislators, who plan to approve $300 million in financial aid to rebel leaders next year.

Encouraged from abroad, the Afghan opposition vigorously resists free elections with the participation of hte Fatherland Party in the country, and rejects any peace moves by Kabul for fear of being allotted a minor role in a democratic Afghanistan.

This is why the missiles rain down on Kabul every day, why the opposition is intensifying combat actions in various regions of the country, without much hope for success.

The "small-scale bloodshed" will, perhaps, continue for a long time yet, unless the two superpowers, Afghanistan's immediate neighbours and all interested sides reach concrete and far-reaching agreements to return peace and tranquility to this war-torn land.

East Europe

Polish Foreign Minister To Visit 10-15 Oct

LD0110174190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 1 Oct 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] At the invitation of the Soviet Government, Foreign Minister Skubiszewski will make an official visit to the USSR on 10-15 October of this year, during which he will visit the RSFSR, the Ukraine, and Belorussia.

Polish Demands for Compensation Examined

PM3009185190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Sep 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by M. Tretyakov under the rubric "Soviet-Polish Relations": "Conjectures and Facts. Are the Claims Justified?"]

[Text] Warsaw-Moscow—The waters of the Bug, which divides two neighboring Slavic peoples, flow quietly and slowly. Our common border has seen a great deal in its time. It has seen the forces of the Polish king advancing on the Moscow Kremlin, Suvorov's army stepping onto Polish soil, the legionaries of Pilsudski, who wanted to create buffer states around Poland's eastern borders in order to defend them from the young Soviet Russia, Red cavalrymen hurrying toward Warsaw, fascist tanks flattening Polish fields before invading Russia, and the victorious Soviet Army, which, together with the Polish Army, brought freedom and independence to the ancient lands of the Piasts. From that moment, the previously troubled and fiery border became a border of friendship. A new period started in the age-old history of relations between the two neighbors, and the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance was the guarantee of its durability.

It is hard to say now, although naturally there are figures somewhere, precisely how much has been built through the joint efforts of Soviet and Polish people and what major technical projects have been realized, not to mention the firm human, scientific, and cultural contacts that have been established over the past few decades. Some people are intent on crossing all this out, debasing it, and slinging mud at it.

The graves of Soviet soldiers who died while liberating Poland are being desecrated. And there are many of them on Polish land—over 600,000. Colonel Skopenko saved Sandomierz from destruction. He died. Before his death he asked to be buried on Sandomierz soil. Now the monument to the heroic Skopenko has been removed from the town center. There is no longer a monument of gratitude to the Soviet soldier-liberators in Gdynia or in a number of other cities. Monuments to V.I. Lenin—by whose decree the country was granted independence in 1918—are being removed in Poland. Groups of rampaging thugs are attacking Soviet diplomatic missions in Krakow and Gdansk. In Sopot some young people burnt Russian textbooks as a deliberate protest. Names of streets and squares connected with the Soviet Union are being changed in Polish cities. And all this is being presented here as an expression of the people's will. Somehow I do not really believe it. I have often talked with ordinary Polish people, who react to such acts with indignation and want to live in friendship and good-neighborliness with us.

For a moment I wondered what would happen if the Polish diplomatic mission was attacked in our country, monuments to famous Polish activists were destroyed, and Polish graves were desecrated. It doesn't bear thinking about. What a stir there would be in the Polish mass media, how we would be fulminated against, what accusations of all kinds of serious sins would be heaped on us. When similar barbaric acts—you cannot call them anything else—occur in Poland with regard to our memorials, only one explanation is offered: "It is just a handful of hooligans, errant young people. There is no need to attach any great significance to this."

I think that there is a need nevertheless. As in any history of relations between two neighboring peoples, there are various pages, including some "black" ones—this befell us too. Essentially we must examine these controversial questions and find mutually acceptable solutions calmly and without emotions or unnecessary haste and irritability, so that in the future our relations are not darkened by "black" pages. Such work is being carried out. Under the Declaration on Soviet-Polish Cooperation in the Sphere of Ideology, Science, and Culture signed in April 1987 by M.S. Gorbachev and W. Jaruzelski, a joint commission of historians was created which has done a great deal of work.

This work is difficult and takes time. But the first results can already be seen. Careful research into the Katyn tragedy has been carried out, including a search for documents. Soviet historians and archivists discovered some documents about Polish servicemen who were kept in the Kozelsk, Starobelsk, and Ostashkov NKVD [People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs] camps. All in all, the archive materials that have been revealed, the published TASS statement notes, make it possible to conclude that Beria, Merkulov, and their assistants were directly responsible for the crimes in the Katyn forest. The Soviet side, expressing deep regret in connection with the Katyn tragedy, states that it is one of the serious crimes of Stalinism. Investigations are continuing.

However, Warsaw is in a hurry. The capital's bookstores are overflowing with publications on the Katyn tragedy whose content is diverse and not always confirmed by genuine documents. Lists of those who died are regularly published in the press. This subject is constantly broached on radio and television broadcasts. The impression emerges that passions have been purposefully fueled over this tragedy for several years now and anti-Soviet moods are being stirred up.

The latest anniversary of the August 1944 Warsaw uprising was observed in the same spirit. From the numerous publications on this subject inexperienced readers, particularly young people, might draw the conclusion that it was not the Hitlerites who drowned rebellious Warsaw in blood, but Stalin, who halted his armies and calmly watched the capital of Poland perish. It was this aspect that was stressed in the Polish mass media, which made no comment on the facts that the uprising started without coordination with the Soviet command, although there was a firm understanding about this, and that unsuccessful efforts were made to cross the Vistula, an important water obstacle, and so on. This has been passed over in silence here. A large-scale propaganda campaign was mounted around the anniversary of the so-called "miracle on the Vistula," which PRAVDA recently wrote about.

Our neighbors across the Bug are making more and more demands and claims. For example, they are demanding that Poland's debt to the Soviet Union be canceled, justifying this by saying that it arose apparently as a result of the Soviet side's deliberate lowering of prices for construction services. It is a question of 5.3 billion transfer rubles [R]. They are insisting that the former "Ossolineum" library in Lvov be returned. They are demanding compensation for the damage suffered by Poles who were the victims of Stalinist repressions, who number, according to Polish estimates, around 200,000-250,000 people. The Polish side is claiming payments of the order of R5-7 billion.

If this continues, some people will start putting forward territorial claims against us. But that is the way it is.

The demands are being submitted officially and they must be answered with documents to hand. Otherwise it will be a pointless discussion. As for canceling the Polish foreign debt to the USSR, then here matters are rather different from the way the Polish side is making out. Economic cooperation between states is carried out on the basis of relevant joint documents and agreements which lay down all the sides' expenditure. The prices for Polish organizations' construction services to the USSR were indeed lower than the world prices. But in return the Poles received petroleum and gas at prices that were also lower than world prices. In 1976-1985 alone Poland's gain as a result of the price difference was R7.6 billion. So who is indebted to whom?

Now a few words about returning the "Ossolineum" library. An explanation is needed here. The Ossolinski public library was founded in 1817 in Vienna by the Galician magnate Count I. Ossolinski and contained his book and manuscript collections. After the count's death, in accordance with his will, in 1827 the collections were transported to Lvov, where they remained until 1939 as the Ossolinski Institute. At this time the library's stock comprised over 300,000 books, early printed publications, and manuscripts of a primarily humanitarian nature, not just about the Polish people, but also other Slavic peoples, including the Ukrainian, Belorussian, Russian, and Czech peoples. In 1946 over 200,000 books, periodicals, and manuscripts from this stock were donated to Poland, and in 1987 another 2,400 or more books were donated. Approximately 70,000 publications remain, which primarily concern the history of the Ukrainian and Belorussian peoples

In principle, we could have not returned anything at all. The Polish authors' viewpoint, that Ossolinski donated the library to the Polish people, is incorrect, to put it mildly. The point is that according to the library's statutes, published in 1857 in Lvov, Count Ossolinski's will says: "I bequeath all my printed books, manuscripts, collections of engravings, maps, medals, pictures, statues, in short, everything relating to science and art that remains my property after my death, to Lvov, capital of Galicia, for the purpose of founding a public library." So the library was left to the city and not to Poland. Those are two quite different concepts.

While submitting demands to us for the return of its cultural assets, the Polish side is ignoring the fact that there are numerous relics of our peoples on Polish territory. So as not to make unsubstantiated statements, I will name just a few cultural assets belonging to the Ukrainian people. Thus: V. Khmelnitsky's goblet—the Czartoryski Museum; P. Doroshenko's saber—the Krakow "Wawelski Zamek" museum, where there is also the banner of the Lvov lands under which Galician soldiers fought at Grunwald; a statue of the Old Slavic god Svyatovid—the Krakow Archeological Museum, and so on. These are the facts.

Instructions have already been given to the relevant Soviet ministries and departments to determine as far as possible forms of compensation for material damage to Polish citizens living on USSR territory who suffered during the years of repression and members of their families. This question is complex, but it is being resolved. Admittedly, we too could present the Polish side with a bill. The fact is that damage from Polish armed intervention in 1920, as well as the losses born by the Ukrainian and Belorussian national economies as a result of the seizure of their western lands in 1919-1939, is estimated at tens of billions of rubles at current prices. There is a precedent in Polish-Soviet relations for submitting this kind of claim. In the Riga Treaty of 1921 the Polish side demanded 30 million gold rubles in gold coins from Russia and the Ukraine as compensation for the active participation of "Polish lands in the economic life of the former Russian empire."

A Soviet Red Cross mission was executed by Pilsudski's gendarmes and soldiers. After Poland's seizure of West Ukrainian lands, there was brutal exploitation, land hunger, national oppression and deprivation of rights, and sometimes bloody repressions. For example, the so-called "pacification"—mass repressions and bloody reprisals against West Ukrainian peasants who rose in defense of their rights—carried out in 1929-1930 provoked protests from the world community.

The "Wisla" action carried out in 1947 against representatives of a Carpathian-Ukrainian nationality—the Lemkowie, who lived on the northern slopes of the West Carpathians, which were part of Poland from the 14th century—has still not been condemned in Poland. Here is what P. Kogutov from Lvov, a veteran of the Great Patriotic War, wrote to the editorial office about this action:

"On 29 March 1947 a decision was taken under the code name 'Action "Wisla"' on the forced deportation of all Ukrainians to western and northern territories of Poland, including the Lemkowie, who lived peacefully with the Poles and had shared all the difficulties and adversities, although they always experienced national oppression from the official authorities.

"On 26 May 1947 at 0400 Polish military subunits started to carry out the action. Everyone was forced to leave their house in two hours and go to the railroad station in a convoy. Each person was allowed to take only what he could carry. In floods of tears, the Lemkowie left their homes, their farms, and their native places and departed for the unknown in freight cars, like criminals. Such was the gratitude for the joint struggle against the fascist occupiers and in support of socialist ideals. The 'Jaworzno' concentration camp, in which around 4,000 prisoners languished, was organized for those who opposed the action. The paradox was that Ukrainian Lemkowie who were volunteers in the Soviet Army and the Polish Army found themselves in this concentration camp. This was genocide of the Ukrainian Lemkowie aimed at the complete assimilation of the Ukrainian population in Poland.

"Great changes have occurred in Poland in the past few years, and democratic forces which have carried out a number of political and economic reforms have come to power. Unfortunately, the Polish authorities still have not condemned 'Action "Wisla,"' rehabilitated the innocent prisoners in the 'Jaworzno' concentration camp, or allowed people who were forcibly resettled to return to their native places."

Naturally we can present bills to each other, shutting our eyes to the fact that during the joint struggle against the fascist occupiers and in the difficult postwar years the Soviet Union constantly came to Poland's assistance and shared its material resources and food with Poland. I will cite just one case: The USSR's assistance to Poland in 1980 alone, when the country was suffering a profound economic crisis, totaled almost 250 million transfer rubles and $850 million, and in 1981 it was estimated at 1.6 billion transfer rubles and as many dollars. A free one-shot credit to the tune of $500 million was also granted.

But there is also another bill, which reader V.V. Berezkov from Tashkent writes about:

"How are we going to pay compensation to the Polish victims of the period of repression—in gold rubles or maybe dollars? Another question springs to mind: Who will compensate our country for the loss of hundreds of thousands of Soviet soldiers, officers, and generals during the liberation of Poland from the Hitlerite invaders? Maybe Hitler and his clique? But with such retrospective bookkeeping, the peoples of the planet will present one another with endless bills. In that case we are all doomed. And who will give absolute guarantees that tomorrow or the day after tomorrow united Germany will not present Poland with territorial claims? In any case, people who revel in all kinds of satisfactions will be found. And what then? Will we begin again? But perhaps there has already been enough of this. We Soviet and

Polish neighbors must, all together and each individually, learn the necessary lessons from our joint history, whose pages were fortunately not always bitter and completely black."

Our two peoples are neighbors and no one is able to change the geographical position of the two states. And we must build our future relations on the basis of amicability and good-neighborliness.

West Europe

Politburo's Semenova Receives FRG Minister

PM0110122390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Meeting Held"]

[Text] G.V. Semenova, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has met with a delegation from the FRG Ministry of Youth, Family, Women and Health Affairs headed by Federal Minister U.-M. Lehr.

There was an exchange of information on approaches to the elaboration of a policy on women and the family in present-day conditions and the need to formulate special programs in this sphere was stressed. Problems of social protection for women at the stage of the transition to the market economy, the creation of an effective vocational training and skill enhancement system, and the acquisition of entrepreneurial skills were touched on.

A mutual interest in further contacts was confirmed.

FRG Housing Project for Red Army Progresses

PM0110132390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Sep 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "FRG: Housing for Soldiers"]

[Text] In the FRG preparations are in full swing to build apartment blocks for the Soviet military servicemen who are returning home as part of the Soviet troop withdrawal from what is presently GDR territory.

According to press reports, in the near future West German ministries and departments expect to complete the preparation of the actual programs and to join the Soviet side in initialling the agreement which will lay down the technical and financial details of the projects.

As is well known, the Soviet Union and the FRG have reached an accord on the FRG's financing of the Soviet troop withdrawal from the territory of the present-day GDR. The FRG has pledged to pay the Soviet Union 12 billion Marks by the end of 1994 with more than seven million of that intended for housing construction.

The plans to build homes for military servicemen have already begun to acquire concrete shape. Most of the apartments will have three rooms, FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE reports, and be from 55 to 60 square meters in area. Some 36,000 will be built with the FRG's help. The Soviet side is planning to build 38,000 in the same period.

FRG Firm Starts Joint Satellite Program

PM0210090790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Report by Oleg Kolin; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Many joint ventures have started up in our country recently. And they have taken the most varied forms—from car production to the organization of beauty contests. Here is a report by Oleg Kolin on one of the most promising projects.

[Kolin] It is no secret that in terms of computerizing our society we are considerably behind many of the developed Western countries. That is why I learned with surprise that the well-known West German communications firm ANT Bosch Telecom is interested in the work of an enterprise near Moscow. Admittedly, it is a special enterprise—the "Energiya" Science and Production Association founded by Academician Korolev. Incidentally, it was here that the first communications satellite—"Molniya-1"—was developed. Today the designers and scientists from Kaliningrad near Moscow are proposing to place heavy communications satellites in orbit using the unique "Energiya" launcher. The all-Union "Energiya-Marafon" Association was recently set up to carry out this plan. A memorandum of cooperation between the association and ANT Bosch Telecom was signed yesterday. It was signed on behalf of the Soviet side by Yuriy Pavlovich Semenov, president of the association and general designer at the "Energiya" Science and Production Association, and on behalf of the West German side by Dr. Dietrich Davids [as heard].

Azerbaijan Group Visits Turkey to Promote Ties

PM0210103590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report by Z. Kadymbekov: "Bridge Over the Araks"]

[Text] An Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] government delegation has returned home after a five-day visit to Turkey. The result of the visit was the signing of a number of documents promoting the development of economic, cultural, and trade relations between the two neighboring countries—the USSR and Turkey.

"I would particularly like to note the agreement that we concluded on behalf of the USSR Government on the construction of a bridge over the Araks river and the opening of an entry point on the Soviet-Turkish border," Gasan Gasanov, leader of the delegation and chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, said.

Metals Plant Polluting Norwegian Border Area

PM0210094390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Report by D. Kiselev, I. Shakhray; from the "Television News Service" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Reporter] This is what a typical landscape in northern Norway looks like at the moment. The Soviet border passes nearby.

This is what you see when the camera is turned toward the East. This is a portrait of the Soviet Union as seen from Norway. At the center of the picture is the "Severonikel" combine. This is the typical scene around the combine. For hundreds of square miles. The "Severonikel" combine is discharging thousands of tonnes of sulfur dioxide into the atmosphere. The natural environment has been killed off. True, children are still being born here, but the incidence of allergies among them is eight times higher than the countrywide average. Cerebral palsy is three times more frequent.

Local inhabitants remember:

[Unidentified woman] There were very tall pines here. Huge trees. We would hang swings from them and play on them. It was beautiful. We simply wallowed in these woods. My small children will unfortunately never see the beauty which I saw as a child.

[Reporter] But our people, displaying educated awareness, just carry on working. It is mainly the neighbors who protest. [passage omitted]

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Adopts Law on Freedom of Conscience

LD0110122290 Moscow TASS in English 1057 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Lev Aksenov, Boris Zverev, and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow October 1 TASS—The Soviet parliament passed a bill "On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organisations" at a joint session of its two chambers here today.

The law guarantees basic freedoms and rights to religious believers and is a basis of a series of similar bills being discussed by legislatures in constituent republics.

It grants believers equal rights in all spheres of life.

The new law envisages the separation of church from the state and from the state education system, stipulating that all faiths are equal before the law.

It prohibits the state from financing religious organisations and atheistic propaganda.

In contrast to previous legislation, the bill bans military commanders from preventing soldiers from attending religious services in their free time.

It also equates labour regulations for employees in religious organisations with those at state organisations. Those employed by religious organisations, including the clergy, will be taxed like ordinary citizens, it says.

Representatives of various Soviet faiths took part in preparing the bill. Their proposals were taken into account in the final text of the bill. Religious figures who took part in the parliamentary debate spoke positively about the draft.

The Soviet law "On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organisations" enters into force immediately on publication.

USSR Supreme Soviet 1 Oct Session Outlined

LD0110200390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1840 GMT on 1 October begins carrying the "At the Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet" program of recorded highlights of the 1 October session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Lukyanov opened today's sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the studio announcer says, adding that deputies examined the draft law on conscience and religious organizations in the second reading. Deputy Sebentsov spoke on this. Deputies adopted a number of amendments and about a dozen articles. Point 4 of Article 6 took longer to debate: Can school premises be used outside school hours to teach religion to schoolchildren?

At 1844 GMT, Patriarch Aleksiy speaks in favor of religion being taught in schools after school hours and outside the framework of the state curriculum.

At 1848 GMT, Roy Medvedev says rural schools might not be well adapted for this sort of thing because the premises are used for other purposes after school hours. He would, however, allow religious teaching in schools and he would allow icons to be hung.

At 1850 GMT, Deputy Bogdanov quotes Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics] figures: 70 percent of schools operate a two-shift system. His school operates a three-shift system. Premises are badly in need of repair. Let the church open its own schools and let us make it easy for it by taxation and so forth. Schools should teach.

At 1851 GMT, Deputy Chelyshev says the draft law does not make it incumbent on schools to organize religious teaching; it merely makes it possible for schools so to do. Another point is: Why is it that we are only talking of the Orthodox Church. We should be talking here of other religions as well.

At 1853 GMT, Deputy Ryabchenko says religion cannot have a monopoly on morality. The main point is that there are regions where people have different religions and different faiths. If school premises are made available for the teaching of religion, it might give rise to conflicts. Local bodies, local schools, and religious leaders should organize this on the spot. Let us remove this article, because everything that is not banned by law is permitted.

At 1856 GMT, Deputy Amonashvili says there are school premises which are bad, but there are also those that are good. The main thing is that religion can contribute toward a spiritual enrichment of schools on a voluntary basis. Religions should be placed on an equal footing here.

AT 1857 GMT, Deputy Belov calls for a vote on whether this point should be left or not.

At 1859 GMT, Deputy Sazonov says he favors religion being taught at schools.

At 1900 GMT, Deputy Saparov says the Article should be removed. Muslims cannot go to schools where icons are displayed on the walls. You can only teach religion in mosques.

At 1901 GMT, an unidentified deputy sees not just religious conflicts, but also children being put at a disadvantage in situations where one religion is taught, but others are not.

At 1903 GMT, Deputy Tutov says religion should be taught on a voluntary basis. It should be up to the parents themselves to decide what to do.

AT 1904 GMT, an unidentified deputy says religion cannot but influence young people, even if it is done on a voluntary basis. The article should be removed from the draft law.

At 1906 GMT, voting takes place but there is no quorum.

At 1907 GMT, Sebentsov gives an account of how the issue was debated in commissions. The recommendation is to have Point 4 of Article 6 removed: 303 vote in favor of removing it, 46 against. The draft law will come into force when it is published.

The next draft law to have been discussed in the second reading, the studio announcer says, was the draft law on public associations in the USSR.

At 1909 GMT, Deputy Kalmykov says Article 16 is of fundamental importance. It is about political parties, mass public movements, and trade unions.

At 1910 GMT, Deputy Kalmykov says that all political parties are equal in the eyes of the law, according to the draft law. The issue of party activities in the Army and law protection bodies is of fundamental importance. There should be no conflict of interest here. This is what all the proposals boil down to. The conclusion that has been reached is: It is not in accordance with the 1966 international pact of civil rights to force someone to leave a party or an association joined voluntarily. Army and police might be subject to certain restrictions here. Internationally, for instance, there are no restrictions on party membership for Army and police people in the Scandinavian countries. Norway says, for instance, that you must be a Norwegian citizen of good repute. But in Turkey, Iran, or Greece, Army and police cannot remain in political parties. In the United States, Spain, and Portugal, party organizations cannot exist in police bodies, but party membership is not disallowed. In France, for instance, servicemen may retain membership of their parties but must refrain from political or trade union activities while in service. The speaker says that the best option is the one offered in the draft: activities of a political nature must be suspended while you are in the police or Army.

At 1922 GMT, Deputy Boldyrev says this draft law must not be accepted because its remit is too wide. The definitions contained therein are too vague and many contingencies are not provided for.

At 1925 GMT, an unidentified deputy says it is important to ensure that this draft law, with its definitions of public organizations and associations, must not be construed by anyone as being aimed at defending the citizen from the state. Another unidentified deputy says that the law should not be adopted.

At 1929 GMT, Deputy Kuptsov says the Legislation Committee carried out a lot of work on this draft law. He is convinced that the rights and duties of trade unions should be regulated by a different law specifically dedicated for this purpose.

At 1932 GMT, an unidentified deputy says the draft law is in accordance with international law and practice and should be adopted. Many people wish to see new political parties and measures must be taken to ensure that this is facilitated.

At 1935 GMT, an unidentified Uzbek deputy praises the draft law. It is a topical law, because the country, in practice, has become a multiparty system. He criticizes the unbridled campaign against the party which, he says, must not be condemned in a wholesale fashion, because even during the dark years of Stalinism there were forces serving the people faithfully.

The draft law was, on the whole, approved of, save for Article 16, the studio announcer says. Ignatovich was elected chairman of the commission on privileges.

Lukyanov then reported on the work of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet.

Supreme Soviet Discusses Social Associations Bill

LD0210081990 Moscow TASS in English 0806 GMT 2 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov, Boris Zverev and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow October 2 TASS—The Soviet parliament today began a clause-by-clause discussion of the bill on social associations, approved on Monday [1 October] in principle after the second reading. The only bone of contention was Article 16, regulating political activity in the Army and law enforcement agencies.

The parliamentary committee on legislation, which sponsored the bill, insists that people should "suspend high political activity" during their service in the Army or law enforcement agencies.

Since the parliament was divided on that point, Article 16 was exempted during the general vote on the bill.

Multiparty Law Adopted 'In Principle'

AU0110192890 Paris AFP in English 1859 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow, Oct 1 (AFP) — The Soviet federal parliament adopted in principle Monday [1 October] a law spelling out conditions for the practice of multi-party politics in the Soviet Union.

Final voting on the legislation, which would create a legal basis for the many organizations that have emerged since the Communist Party's leading role was scrapped in March, is to begin article-by-article on Tuesday.

Deputies failed to agree whether political parties should be allowed in the Army and omitted the pertinent article from their vote Monday. They left the issue for the debate starting Tuesday.

The multi-party law was adopted in principle on a vote of 316 to 25, with 23 abstentions. Nine other MPs were present but did not vote.

Under the proposed text, a minimum of 10 people may set up a "social organization", but it must have 5,000 members to exist legally on a national level.

MPs were divided over Article Three, which bans the activities "of organizations which have as their goal, or work toward, overthrowing the Constitution by force, (which) violate the territorial integrity of the union, of united or autonomous republics, disseminate war propaganda, (or) stir up social and class hatred".

The article also prohibits the existence of organizations that "stir up national or religious hatred, adopt a military structure or include armed groups".

Another problem emerged over an article saying military personnel and justice officials must cease political activities. Some MPs are members of the Armed Forces and judges.

The government proposed this issue be settled in laws covering the "army and justice" due to go before parliament shortly and the article, as a result, was excluded from Monday's vote.

Lukyanov Updates Deputies on Ukraine Situation

LD0110175690 Moscow TASS in English 1701 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov, Boris Zverev, and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow October 1 TASS—Soviet parliament chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov this evening informed deputies about developments in the Ukraine, where the republican strike committee called for a general strike today.

He said 27 taxi drivers in Kiev, Ukraine's capital, and several enterprises in Lvov and Ternopol, the western Ukraine, went on strike.

Lukyanov said columns of demonstrators began to gather at a Kiev stadium at 10:00 this morning to "exert an influence on the opening session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet".

By 15:00-17:00, the number of demonstrators had reached 15,000 to 20,000, including about 7,000 people from the western Ukraine.

"Demonstrators unfurled a great number of flags and carried all kinds of slogans, demanding the Ukraine's withdrawal from the Soviet Union and non-conclusion of the Union treaty," Lukynov said.

He said the session of the Ukrainian parliament did open and was going on. "Some deputies, who expressed their disagreement and tried to influence the session, refused to participate in it."

Lukyanov said the "attempt to hold some mass actions proved futile".

According to reports from Kiev, the majority of work collectives in the Ukraine did not support the strike call.

However, the huge demonstration paralysed traffic in the centre of Kiev for two hours this morning.

Demonstrators' demands for the resignation of the Ukrainian government and the dissolution of parliament coincide with appeals of the Ukrainian Republican Party, the Union of the Ukrainian Independent Youth and the militant wing of the Ukrainian Rukh People's Movement [for Perestroyka].

Text of Resolution on New Union Treaty Published

PM0110234590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1

["Resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet 'On the Progress of Consultations on and the Elaboration of Concepts of a New Union Treaty'"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To recognize the report of Comrade R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, on the consultations held in July-September 1990 with representatives of Union and autonomous republics and political parties and movements on elaborating the concept of a new Union treaty.

2. To note that a unity of views of the representatives of the majority of republics on the new makeup of the Union, the transition to a Union-wide market, and the ensuring of the country's security has emerged as a result of the consultations, which creates the necessary basis for further elaboration of the concept of a new Union treaty.

3. To deem it appropriate when elaborating the draft of a new Union treaty to take account of the comments and proposals expressed by USSR people's deputies during discussion of this question and also the recommendations of USSR Supreme Soviet committees and standing commissions of the chambers.

4. To adopt the proposal of the USSR president on forming a preparatory committee to elaborate the concept and initial draft of a new Union treaty as part of the powers of the representatives of Union republics, the USSR president, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

To deem appropriate the participation of representatives of autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs in the work of the preparatory committee.

5. All work to prepare a new Union treaty is to be conducted in an atmosphere of glasnost and with consideration of the opinion of the public and the broad strata of the population.

The mass media are to be recommended to cover the progress of preparing the draft of a new Union treaty systematically and comprehensively, objectively reflecting different positions and standpoints.

6. Regarding a new Union treaty as the basis for the radical renewal of the USSR and as an important factor in extricating society from its state of crisis, the USSR Supreme Soviet calls on state organs, public organizations and movements, and all citizens to show restraint and responsibility at this difficult time for the future of our peoples.

[Signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet
The Kremlin, Moscow, 1 October 1990

Political & Social

Russian Democratic Forum Program Criticized

*PM0210100190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Sep 90 Second Edition pp 1, 2*

[Article by Candidate of Historical Sciences Yu. Makhrin under the "Response" rubric: "What the 'Democrats' Are Preparing"]

[Text] As already reported in our newspaper, on 26 August a people's deputy drew attention at a USSR Supreme Soviet session to the article "Who Needs Rotting Potatoes?" published in PRAVDA that same day. He observed that this alarming article made one think about the need to hold an inquiry at the parliamentary level.

The speaker went on to say that the writer discusses in the article "Action Program-90," a program for seizing power, while he, a people's deputy, knew nothing about it.

Yes, the situation is indeed paradoxical and inconceivable for a state that has proclaimed the law to be paramount and which is seeking to become a rule-of-law state. The manifesto of the intransigent opposition is circulating in Moscow and the cities and villages of the country, while the representatives of the country's organ of power remain uninformed about what the "Russian Democratic Forum" [RDF] is preparing to carry out soon. Its main objective is: "To achieve the CPSU's removal from the political arena, to disband its ranks, and to nationalize its property" "chiefly in line with the methods worked out by the Democratic Platform leadership."

It goes on: "Given that the majority of local soviets are under the control of old reactionary forces and many of today's personnel of even relatively progressive soviets will become conservative in two to three years, local undemocratic procedures should be smashed and a revolutionary policy of emancipation and democratization be carried out by means of mass organized actions (rallies, demonstrations, picketing, strikes, civil disobedience campaigns, the unauthorized occupation of buildings, and so forth)."

Everything in the 32-point directive document is clearly spelled out: When a particular "democratization" action should be held, who should do it, and the methods to be used. It is planned: "to transfer land to private ownership free of charge" and "to eliminate kolkhozes and sovkhozes [collective and state farms]." "It is recommended that detachments of squatters, numbering around 50 people, be organized." "It is planned to declare 7 November National Disaster Day" and "to abolish the celebration of that date." It also recommends people "take a most active part in dismantling monuments to Karl Marx, V.I. Lenin, Friedrich Engels, Ya.M. Sverdlov, F.E. Dzerzhinksiy, and other idols of the previous criminal regime."

It also envisages a general political strike demanding the government's resignation, the early dissolution of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the "nationalization" of trade union property, and the introduction of their own elements into the structure of power....

As in an official document, the "program" carries publishing details: "Adopted by the Russian Democratic Forum Council of Representatives. Moscow, 31 July. Organizing committee of the Fourth RDF Congress." Telephone numbers and addresses are supplied for those who wish to submit "ideas on the proposed draft."

Of course, the "program" does contain a number of positive proposals aimed against the intolerance of extremist trends and at improving the social protection of people during the transition to the market economy and reducing interethnic conflicts. However, on the whole this document is destructive in intent and is imbued with a spirit of intolerance and hostility toward everything that its authors dislike.

And this entire far-reaching plan should be "propagandized in every way possible by independent local and central mass media."

Incidentally, a reasonable idea (unfortunately, it did not form part of the acccount published on 26 September, but does figure in the minutes) was put forward during the round-table meeting with representatives of sociopolitical parties and movements held in PRAVDA's editorial office. Let us quote: "A Russian Democratic Forum document has been read out here. But why is there no expert legal report on the document? After all, it does contain (this is clear even to me, a nonlawyer) individual elements which call for the forcible overthrow of particular sociopolitical, state, and other structures. Why cannot we, then, as a united bloc speak out against such actions by individual political structures and groups, as is done in a civilized state?"

I consider that a reasonable and timely proposal! And USSR people's deputies and their colleagues in other organs of Soviet power could carry out such an analysis so that they can understand and explain to the electorate what certain Russian "democrats" are preparing.

Gorbachev-Yeltsin Ties Examined

LD2909220290 Leningrad Maritime Press Service in Russian 1400 GMT 20 Sep 90

[Commentary by observer Vladimir Kirillyuk; from the "Baltic Seaman"]

[Text] It is intended that from 1 January 1991 the Soviet economy will start operating according to market laws. In the fall the parliamentarians will adopt the necessary documents on this account. Governmental, parliamentary, and other commissions, as well as a joint group formed on the instruction of M.S. Gorbachev, the USSR president, and B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, who have considered it necessary to combine their efforts for the sake of common progress, which is important, both for the cause of the federation and for the cause of Russia, have been working on the federation union and Russian programs for a transition to a market economy.

The work of this group has been followed with heightened interest both because of the importance of the problem of the market economy itself, and because Gorbachev and Yeltsin have at least set off on the path of practical cooperation.

It is well-known that for a long time they did not get on and were frankly alienated. This gave rise to alarm, since without unity of actions of the federation and Russia one cannot count on overcoming the present crisis and deepening economic disorders. And it was precisely unity which was not felt. In the middle of July the threat of direct confrontation in their relations was noticeable. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet independently, without coordination with the federation, adopted a decision to reform and to isolate the republican banking system. In the opinion of many, this action was not thought out, and economically dangerous, if not destructive. The USSR State Bank administration, having prepared a draft general bank reform by this time, protested vehemently, accusing the Russian parliamentarians of partisanship and financial incompetence. The USSR president was forced to issue a decree declaring the RSFSR decision invalid and illegal. New complications were expected, but did not ensue. PRAVDA wrote that in the complex Gorbachev-Yeltsin situation they have managed to overcome confrontational trends and to conclude an alliance for the sake of deepening reform, having agreed to closely coordinate efforts in the preparation for a transition to a market economy.

The forthcoming voyage to an unknown shore alarms the public, especially those citizens who today can hardly make ends meet. For them the market is associated above all with a price hike, and the fact that inflation is unavoidable can be judged by the worsening supply to the population of foodstuff and other consumer goods, the almost empty shop shelves. There is little faith in the government's promises to socially protect the underprivileged from inflation and possible unemployment. The alliance of the efforts of Gorbachev and Yeltsin for the sake of stability gives rise to slightly greater hopes, but they are rather for those who are optimistic by nature. Moreover, it is not clear how long this promising cooperation between the two leaders will last, whether it will lead to their actual and productive alliance or whether it will turn out to be a brief truce.

The facts force one to think that the divergences in the positions and aspirations of Gorbachev and Yeltsin are greater than their similarities. For market relations to start working effectively and to induce material consumer growth as quickly as possible, it will be necessary to subordinate all other interests to the requirements of a market economy, putting off, if only temporarily, everything bearing the taint of separatist feelings, and aspirations, in some way to secede from the union as a single national economy complex. A market economy needs unity. Gorbachev's stance on this issue is unambiguous. From the very beginning he has been doing everything to maintain the stability of economic relations within the country and the federation itself as an integrating foundation. For Gorbachev, the transformation of state structures and the creation of a new union are not a self-sufficient principle, but a consequence of the general renovation of the country and the renaissance of a reformed economy. The new federation is new through being filled, but not through changed structures. This is his key thought.

Yeltsin sees the union and the imperative requirement of its unity in calmer, less acute, terms. The old union, the center, as it is now expressed, has not justified expectations and in many respects has discredited itself. A new union is necessary, such as the republics, the main subjects of the future state, will consider necessary to create. It seems to me that the Russian leader's views on all other issues ensue from this.

The contours of Yeltsin's approach to the renewal of the Soviet state appeared during his recent fact-finding trip around Russia in late August. Incidentally, he was received everywhere not only as the head of the highest legislative authority, but also as Russian leader number one, the republic's unofficial president, which demonstrates the popularity of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman. During the meetings in Bashkiria, Tataria, and other regions, Yeltsin was asked how he relates to the autonomous formations' intention to raise the issue of their sovereignty. The Russian leader replied almost invariably: Take whatever degree of sovereignty you consider you can digest.

This must be a good answer for a politician, if one ignores the actuality of the present situation and needs of the country. Consultations have begun between the centre and the republics on the conclusion of a union treaty. On the agenda is a leap into the unknown—toward new economic relations—where the stability of relations is particularly important. Is it apposite under such circumstances to make declarations, encouraging the intentions of the autonomous formations regarding sovereignty and the beginning of a new round of demarcational work?

But Yeltsin is not a pragmatist, and does not adopt a wait-and-see attitude until extremes cool down. Caution, judging by the facts, is not in his rules. But in this case it was too late to get off with vague generalities, since even before the trip around the republic, on 6 August, Yeltsin had signed a decision of the presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet "on a competition for the best version of a draft federative RSFSR treaty." A jury was formed, substantial prizes established, and the timescale for the presentation of materials for the competition was fixed as 15 October 1990. In short, in the depths of Russia work is developing for the preparation of a federative treaty which postpones indefinitely the problems of a union treaty. Attention is being switched to republican affairs. V.B. Iaskaov, chairman of the Soviet of the Republic of the Supreme Soviet, has explained in the press that the conclusion of a union treaty cannot come before the conclusion of a federative treaty. First, what Russia is must be established.

Now the question is not even what Russia will become. It is more important that it will transform itself, stand aside, when most important of all is stabilization and the maintenance of mutual relations. How can one assume that a substantial transformation is ahead. Russia itself has shown as example. In the declaration on its state sovereignty the following provisions are the most important:

1. The republic's full power regarding the resolution of all issues of state life, excluding those which it has voluntarily ceded to the jurisdiction of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

2. The supremacy of the constitution and laws of the RSFSR over the whole territory of Russia, whereby the acts passed by the union must not contradict the republic's acts, without their validity being suspended.

Both Yeltsin and people from his team have stressed on more than one occasion that the republic should observe these principles not only in relations with the union, but that they should also be extended below—to autonomous republics and other national formations, territories, even to enterprises, collective farms, right down to the person, to the full provision of his rights. Yeltsin has also used the extreme expression "the sovereignty of man," although recently he has not resorted to it. But at the same time dozens of sovereign autonomous formations with the supremacy of their laws over Russian ones will also hardly strengthen the law and order and the clear-cut conduct of affairs in the federation. It only remains to be hoped that the process will not go that far and that common sense will gain the upper hand.

To what extent will Gorbachev succeed in stifling the trends which are evident in the state restructuring of Russia? How will their retarding effect on the economy be neutralised? Or do miracles also occur in politics, and will the multi-directional movement of the economy to market relations and the Russian autonomous formations to independence give rise to a paradoxical success?

Italian Daily Interviews Yakovlev

PM2809143890 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 27 Sep 90 p 21

[Interview with CPSU Presidential Council member Aleksandr Yakovlev by Paolo Garimberti; place and date not given]

[Excerpt] Paris—[passage omitted] [Garimberti] So, Aleksandr Nikolayevich, how will Gorbachev use his special powers?

[Yakovlev] He will use them according to the guidelines given to him by parliament—to implement the economic reforms and to strengthen public order by ensuring that the laws are applied. Nothing more, because the limitations set by the Supreme Soviet are very precise.

[Garimberti] The impression in the West is that you have reached this decision too late. The USSR is in a state of chaos. The economy and the nationalities are in a state of ferment, and crime is on the increase: Nothing works, and people are increasingly dissatisfied. Is Gorbachev not in danger of shutting the stable door when the horse has bolted?

[Yakovlev] Perhaps, but I believe that we are still in time to salvage the country. You see, we could not have adopted this decision before. It would have been imprudent because it would have been unpopular. Even a few months ago the prevalent feeling among the public was that it was necessary to reduce the center's powers in favor of those of the republics and local authorities. But not everyone agrees that the situation has become intolerable. Even the republican leaders agree that only a strong central government can adopt reform measures that are both exceptional and urgent in character. Indeed the requests for help from Moscow have come from the republics themselves. I can tell you that we were tempted to reply: You wanted sovereignty? Now sort things out yourselves. But that would have been self-damaging.

[Garimberti] Perhaps you were reluctant to propose special powers for reasons of image, not only at home but internationally, too. Were you afraid that the USSR would be accused of having become totalitarian again?

[Yakovlev] It is not only a question of image, but also one of substance. We are still in a transitional phase; the authoritarian traditions have not been entirely eliminated in our country. Democracy has not yet taken root in people's minds.

[Garimberti] Unless I am mistaken, the dilemma that has troubled you has been that between democracy and stability. Am I right?

[Yakovlev] For my part, I am profoundly convinced that with authoritarian methods you only obtain temporary stability. In order for stability to be real and permanent there must be democracy. This is why it is important for Gorbachev's special powers to be embodied within the limits of the existing laws and for them not to transcend these limits. He cannot, and must not, be placed above the law. Gorbachev received his special powers from parliament, which will monitor their application.

[Garimberti] But does this new situation not threaten to create problems with the republics and, above all, to destroy the alliance between Gorbachev and Yeltsin?

[Yakovlev] I do not believe that there will be any problems with the republics. As I told you, the requests to this effect came from them, too. As for Yeltsin, I do not see what kind of difficulties could emerge: It was precisely the Russian parliament that was the first to vote for the move to a market economy. So their aims are the same.

[Garimberti] But I cannot understand how Gorbachev can combine the so-called Shatalin plan, which envisages a radical transition to the market economy, with Prime Minister Ryzhkov's plan, which is much more gradual.

[Yakovlev] Of course a purely mechanical merger is impossible, and nobody wants that. The good parts must be taken from the government program, nothing more. And there are some good things in it.

[Garimberti] So the Shatalin plan will be very prominent in Gorbachev's option. Can we deduce from this that the Soviet Union is about to change to a pure market economy?

[Yakovlev] Was there any other choice, do you think? No, there was not. There was not, because experience has shown that the other solutions—I mean mixed solutions—do not work. There is no third way; it is no good mincing words. Look, I would not even call it a market economy. I would call it an economy based on economic interests.

[Garimberti] So why does Gorbachev want at all costs to save Ryzhkov, who is so unpopular?

[Yakovlev] It is not a matter of saving Ryzhkov. There is another reason: At the moment we cannot permit ourselves the luxury of undermining the government. Our economy is not in the hands of businessmen; it is in the government's hands. I realize that you in the West cannot understand this. Because in your part of the world if the government collapses the economy carries on working; the businessmen make sure that it functions. I am convinced that may people in the Western countries barely notice if there is a government crisis. The country continues on its own. But for the time being in our country the economy is entirely in the state's hands. And in our present disastrous situation the absence of an executive would be a catastrophe within a disaster. When we have a market economy here, too, it will be possible to change governments without damaging the economy.

[Garimberti] The granting of special powers to Gorbachev does reveal two things, however: that the USSR is on the brink of the abyss, but also that the institutional structures do not work. Now that the party's leading role no longer exists, how does the decisionmaking process take place in the USSR?

[Yakovlev] It takes place through the state institutions—the president, the government, parliament. As in your country.

[Garimberti] But what is the Presidential Council, of which you are a member? The prince's cabinet? A consultative body? A decisionmaking body?

[Yakovlev] It is a little of all the things that you mention. It advises the president, but it also makes decisions.

[Garimberti] And how important is the party?

[Yakovlev] The party has a political role, as a party should. It must seek to influence decisionmaking processes by using political weapons. The CPSU is currently in a very special kind of transition phase in which it is seeking its new position within society.

[Garimberti] Let us return to the crisis of the USSR, to what we call the disintegration of the empire. Will you succeed in controlling the republics' centrifugal thrusts?

[Yakovlev] Look, I believe that the various republics do not have much intention of separating from the USSR. They issue threats, and more threats, but ultimately.... We say to them all: You want to leave? Please go ahead, but obey the laws. This is what we did with the Baltic republics, too. We said: Hold your referendums; if the secession proposal receives a majority vote, then leave. But they did not do this. They replied to us that referendums are unnecessary because the Baltics never joined the USSR; they were annexed. This is true, of course, but now, constitutionally, the referendum is necessary in order to know what the people want.

[Garimberti] On the subject of secessions, what impression did Solzhenitsyn's article make on you? Why did it have such an impact in the Sovet Union?

[Yakovlev] I do not believe that it had a great impact. People have read a great deal, they have read all sorts of things in recent years, so they are less easily shocked. In fact the Ukrainians did not welcome the article, nor did the Kazakhs. I do not attach too much importance to it. It was Solzhenitsyn's personal opinion and it was published in the newspapers, as is right and normal in the USSR. That is all there is to it.

[Garimberti] But there was a major religious demonstration in Moscow Sunday. Do you not believe that this extraordinary interest in religion is in line with what Solzhenitsyn says?

[Yakovlev] No. There were major religious demonstrations even before the article was published. Personally, I do not believe that the religious revival is a sign of democracy. This nostalgia is not only reactionary but senseless. But in all democracies there are the politicians, the exploiters of politics, and the politickers.

[Garimberti] Mr. Yakovlev, you were the architect of glasnost and a great supporter of perestroyka—two words that have had great success worldwide. Do you believe that they are still valid today? In view of the country's situation, would it not perhaps be better to talk in terms of refounding, rather than restructuring?

[Yakovlev] In my opinion, the real perestroyka has only just begun; it has begun in these past few days. As for glasnost, openness, in my opinion it has no limits of application, only moral limits. Hitherto glasnost has been spoken of chiefly with regard to the press, freedom of expression. But I have always believed that it should be applied to all fields, including politics. And while openness has progressed a great deal with regard to freedom of expression, the same cannot be said of politics. In this field we still have a long way to go.

Dzasokhov Examines CPSU's Contemporary Role

LD2809182790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 28 Sep 90

[Text] In Moscow State University's House of Culture, a meeting was held today between Dzasokhov, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, and participants of the all-Union meeting on humanizing higher education and restructuring the teaching of social and political sciences.

Comrade Dzasokhov characterized the public and political situation in the country. Particular attention was paid to the role of the CPSU in contemporary society, the political nature of its activities, and the work of the Politburo and the CPSU central committee secretariat.

Among the most acute problems are the handing over of the functions of authority to the soviets, the preparations for concluding a new Union treaty, the transfer of the economy to market relations, the liberation of the spiritual sphere, the renewal of the party's cadres, and the international aspects of the CPSU's activities.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary revealed the features and significance of the documents adopted by the 28th party congress. He called on social scientists in higher education to participate actively in understanding the decisions of the party forum and in developing the clauses of the CPSU draft program to meet the actual problems of the current transfer period. He spoke in favour of creative cooperation between the CPSU and other political organizations and movements in the interests of civil accord and the stabilization of public life.

An open conversation took place on the role of the social and political sciences in humanizing education. Much attention was paid to the problem of understanding the depoliticization and de-ideologizing of education, the position of the CPSU on this question, and also to the educational aspects of working with the young.

PRAVDA Rejects Attacks on Communist Press

PM0110121790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 90 Second Edition p 6

[Unattributed note printed alongside PRAVDA subscription form: "We're With You!"]

[Text] The changes in the country's political life sometimes lead to acute ideological conflicts. In conditions of democracy and glasnost this is understandable and explicable. But what is the reason for the attacks to which the Communist press has been subjected in the subscription campaign period?

Some people now are trying to make people think that PRAVDA is a conservative newspaper—a fact which certain publications are relishing. They are even urging people to boycott the newspaper.

Let us ask bluntly: Who are the people who do not need PRAVDA? It can be answered equally bluntly that as a rule they are the wheeler dealers of the "shadow economy" and the criminal world, the major and minor leaders of the nationalist movements, and the bureaucrats of all hues—in brief, those people who do not like the newspaper's clear stand in defense of the socialist choice and the working man and in support of the renewal of society.

We are convinced that the country's Communists will side with PRAVDA in the common struggle for perestroyka. At this difficult time for the country, we are with you, we are together!

Moscow's Organized Crime Examined

PM2609135890 London MOSCOW NEWS in English No 17, 21-26 Sep 90 p 15

[Article by Aleksandr Kabakov: "The Roaring Nineties. Gangsters Are Turning Moscow Into the Chicago of Al Capone"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Moscow is witnessing an unprecedented surge in organised crime. Gangs of armed racketeers don't baulk at murder and brand victims with hot irons to extort money. These are usually successful entrepreneurs who pay up to avoid pain. Many have made their fortunes on the black market. Together with the racketeers they are the Soviet Union's nouveaux riches. Their lavish lifestyle contrasts painfully with the poverty of ordinary citizens. In a limbo where central control has crumbled and a market economy has not yet taken root, the rule is: whatever is not forbidden is permissible.

Soviet life has long been Alice's Wonderland: it seems normal but is in fact a distortion. Though in comparison with most civilised countries the majority of Soviets are poor or very poor, we also have our nouveaux riches. Of course, they are rich only by Soviet standards, so their life style is lavish only as seen through the looking glass.

A short time ago, the Olympus restaurant, an inconspicuous brick-and-glass barn near the Luzhniki stadium, was the venue for a wedding party. The feast was for 120 people, and the restaurant was closed to uninvited guests. The groom's father paid 5,000 roubles in advance and at least as much again.

In addition to the regular band, there were five performers engaged for the evening to entertain the guests. About 30 cars were parked near the entrance. The Volgas and Lada sports models looked like poor cousins to the Mercedes, Nissans and a slightly scruffy-looking BMW.

Patrolling the parking lot were plain-clothes and uniformed militiamen with walkie-talkies, a riot police officer in combat fatigues (a busload of his men waiting nearby), and a special traffic police squad instructed by the militia commanders in charge of the whole operation "to ward off the cars of uninvited guests after 7 pm, once the guests had sat down to supper". Militia uniforms were stretched tight over bullet-proof vests, and the riot police were armed with automatic weapons.

The presence of the militia was accounted for by the fact that the wedding party was made up of what official reports called "persons residing in Lyubertsy" (a Moscow suburb notorious for its criminal activity), while the restaurant was known to be patronised by "persons of Caucasian nationality".

Translated into plainer words borrowed from the Chicago jargon of the 1920s and '30s, the police feared another clash between the Lyubertsy and Chechen clans of Moscow's Cosa Nostra, between the suburban "brigade" and the "Chechen community" (Chechens being a small Caucasian nation scattered all over the country).

The residents of Lyubertsy got out of their cars and walked in without giving as much as a moment's notice to the militia forces amassed for their benefit. Fashionable jackets were stretched over their muscular torsos. The riot police grumbled about having to guard thieves. The party drank the health of Uncle Kolya whose wedding present was considered to be the most generous: a wad of bank notes three centimetres thick.

The co-operative restaurant Olympus is a haunt of ex-sportsmen, a few pop stars and Oriental diplomats. It is also frequented by people calling themselves Chechens. So far, according to the 135th Militia Precinct of the Luzhniki area, there have been no shoot-outs or serious incidents. But every night tension builds up as the militia orders the band to stop playing at midnight while guests continue to demand their favourite tunes, having paid their hard-earned 300 roubles for the privilege.

There are quite a few such places around Moscow. Some 15 years ago a cheap and squalid glass-enclosed cafe sprang up in the very centre of Moscow, at the crossing of Bolshaya and Malaya Bronnaya Streets. Today, Cafe Aist (Crane) is little changed on the outside except for the dark red curtains now draped over its glass walls.

Towards dark, BMWs and Volvos pull up and impressive-looking men in second-hand Italian suits (at 2,000 roubles each) saunter in after their garrishly dressed overweight lady friends. Waiting inside the cars are young thugs in jogging suits.

A dinner for two at a place like this costs 150 to 200 roubles. No drinks are served, but visitors are allowed to bring a bottle of whisky (costing 80 roubles and officially sold in most big food stores), or ask the friendly waiter to procure a bottle of champagne (priced by the waiter at 20 roubles or more, depending on the client).

The place is quiet. It is a haven for big-time co-operative bosses and black marketeers. The bodyguards patiently waiting in the cars are status symbols rather than active hitmen.

Pensioners living on 80 roubles a month in the tenement house behind the cafe often find almost untouched helpings of roast beef in the rubbish bins. The needs of various social groups are catered for by Aist.

The bodyguards have their own playgrounds. These are generally cheaper, rougher, and not necessarily co-operative. The restaurants and bars of the the Hotel Soyuz on the outskirts of Moscow are an example. Rumour has it that the doormen will not admit militia patrols when the young thugs go on a spree.

Well, Hotel Soyuz is far away, and big money prefers more central locations. European and American guests at Intourist bars and restaurants within an easy walk of the Kremlin mingle with Soviets paying in non-Soviet money.

Possessing foreign currency is no longer criminal for Soviet citizens, but one wonder how a 20-year-old girl with tired features has come by her Japanese yen, or why a bloke with a tattoo saying "Senya" (a common abbreviation for Semen) showing under his Lacoste T-shirt can offord to pay in dollars. It is easy to guess.

To enter the International Trade Centre today, a Moscow hard-currency prostitute pays 200-300 roubles at the door. A short time ago all doormen were replaced. Before that the admission fee was 100 roubles.

They are small fry, of course. The really rich, that is to say Soviet with lots of hard currency, frequent the Savoy casino. Watched by dismayed foreigners and ever-present bodyguards, they lose and win hundreds of dollars, pay in ten-dollar bills for beer and whisky at the bar and feel rich. Members of the world's elite.

One can get the most surprising results by studying the perestroika nouveaux riches with the help of arithmetic. Anyone starting a co-op, whether a gentleman or a racketeer, must have a Mercedes, a video, a leather jacket, and a pack of Marlboro in his pocket.

The latest Mercedes model on the Moscow black market is now 250,000 roubles. The black market exchange rate is 20 roubles to the dollar. "A mere 12,500 dollars for a good Mercedes is nothing!" any European or American will exclaim.

The same is true of video equipment, cigarettes and other status symbols. It appears that our black market prices for ordinary Western commodities are quite ordinary, too. They are lower or equal to average world market prices.

There is a difference, though. $12,000 amounts to four months' wages for an American white-collar worker and is equivalent to what a top Soviet executive earns over 30 years.

The Soviet rich spend their millions on what is widely available to ordinary people in the civilised countries. But the customs and manners of the newly rich do not depend on exchange rates. An upstart is an upstart anywhere, whether in the Wild West at the turn of the century, or on a Moscow farm market today. Adventurism and poor taste reign supreme.

Lawyer Aleksandr Gurov said in a recent interview. "Social and economic standards have gone down in the past few years and crime prevention mechanisms have been weakened. The ruling principle now is: What-ever is not forbidden is permissible. One can expect a boom in organised crime as the market economy develops."

Mr. Gurov's opinion is very much in line with the general belief, especially widespread among elderly women having nothing whatsoever to do with either law or the shadow economy: "Life is getting increasingly dangerous. People are getting killed on the streets!"

Yet Aleksandr Kartashov, an expert with practical experience in combatting organized crime, believes that the rise in organized crime recorded in the last few years does not directly affect the safety of ordinary citizens.

Torture by branding with a hot iron, murder, and other forms of violence do not, as a rule, threaten those who have nothing to give. Moreover, Soviet businessmen generally settle accounts with bands of racketeers without volence. Two or three thugs are taken on by the co-operative as guards, and the rest get a quarter of the co-op's profits as protection money.

Nevertheless, the forces of the Moscow Regional executive committee's department combatting organised crime are now well-armed and ready to use their arms. Colts and paratroopers' sub-machine guns have superseded less powerful weapons. They are used mostly when racketeers are being arrested or to stop show-downs between rival gangs.

The criminals are well-armed, too. A heavy machine gun was used recently to settle territorial claims between two gangs. Flame-throwers are regularly confiscated during militia raids.

In peace time, however, muscular fellows quietly play cards at co-op headquarters: they are on duty. With time, the brightest of them might make it to the top and be followed by their own body-guards to the casino, restaurant or hard currency shop. Possibly to a government agency or department, too.

This growing business is getting more civilised and legal, and is increasingly involved in socially useful activities. Some Soviet businessmen have even become philanthropists and art patrons.

For the time being, however, the lucky members of the so-called shadow economy (Russian usage is different from the international one in that our businessmen sell mostly T-shirts, not drugs) are having "the time of their lives".

At the Savoy, one of them thrust a tenner at his bodyguard and said lazily: "Go fetch a bottle." The guy stood to attention: "Yes, Sir, Yuriy Ivanovich!" His manner reminded me of the provincial corridors of power in the early 1980s. The old economy has left behind a shadow, and the new economy can't help beginning there.

Alas, the general prosperity always begins with this tasteless and obnoxious luxury for the few against the background of poverty and even destitution of the many. The descendants of gold-diggers, adventurers and brawlers are today's Harvard graduates, computer magnates, and ideologists of social and ecological movements.

One can only hope that, as time is moving faster at the end of the 20th century, our "capitalist sharks" will not take a hundred years to turn into post-industrial entrepreneurs.

Bakatin Interviewed on Presidential Council, MVD

90UN2849A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian No 37, Sep 90 pp 4-5

[Interview with Vadim Bakatin by Yevgeniy Sorokin; place and date not given: "I Am Tortured by the Question of Why We Cannot Live in Peace Here in Our Own Country"]

[Text] [Sorokin] How did you, Vadim Viktorovich, take your appointment to the Presidential Council? Why did the president choose you: Was it the office or the individual that was important?

[Bakatin] I cannot answer this question precisely. Only the president himself, probably, could answer it; I can only guess. But speaking about conjectures is inappropriate. I took my appointment seriously and responsibly. Being a member of the Presidential Council is a big honor, of course. And at the same time a new workload.

Presidential authority is personal authority. Understandably, it is the job of members of the council to assist the president in decisionmaking, more precisely, to give advice. Hence the name—Presidential Council. Being pleasing to the president is the easiest thing of all. But is this the point of it? Members of the Presidential Council frequently express highly contradictory opinions, even polar opposite at times. And the president listens closely to all and makes his own choice when making a decision.

[Sorokin] You head one of the hottest sectors of social restructuring—the restructuring of people and social relations. What problems would you distinguish in this work? How are the authorities of the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] being restructured?

[Bakatin] A very complex question, and there is no unequivocal answer. I would like to mention that the MVD is not the main "restructurer" of people and human relations. This is immense work, and we participate on a par with others. We have our own area of work and are performing our own specific assignments.

But in order for society to be restructured, stability is needed. And here we encounter a paradox: In order to achieve stability we need to restructure. It is important that the transition from one qualitative condition of society to another, given a constant complication of both the atmosphere and the assignments, not build up tension. A more stable atmosphere is needed in order that business proceed dependably. More radical steps, given public concord, are needed.

The principal constitutional assignment of MVD authorities is safeguarding public order and fighting crime. Today we are speaking about public safety. The politicization of society is exerting a very strong influence on our activity. The MVD authorities have to take account of diverse factors and phenomena and distinctive changes in society. New problems are emerging. How to operate in this situation or the other previously unknown to us?

Things are further complicated by the fact that the militia is working on the old, rather outdated legal base. Take the fight against crime. What do we use as a basis? After all, until recently crime was categorized as a rudiment of the old society, as a birthmark of the exploiter system. And as we moved toward "developed socialism," this rudiment would wither away. Proceeding from this concept, the state did not concern itself unduly with strengthening the law enforcement system.

At the same time a growth of criminal manifestations in the transition period, that is, from the beginning of the restructuring of social and economic relations, has been evident. Our law enforcement system has proven very inadequate and unadapted. And the modernization and renewal of the legal foundation have become the primary task. Of course, much will depend on the USSR Supreme Soviet and its legislative activity. This means an entire package: from the level of wages through outward appearance, from the jurisdiction of personnel through provision of the services with equipment. A turnabout will not be accomplished by an edict or a single decision here. A great deal of purposive work is needed.

[Sorokin] And not, certainly, alone, in isolation from society?

[Bakatin] It stands to reason: after all, the militia employees are part of Soviet society. We endure the same burdens as other citizens of the country. The crisis phenomena have not passed us by. And there are many black spots. Corruption in society—the militia also is infected with this disease. Or, say nationalism—we shall not close our eyes to the fact that there are people afflicted with this ailment in our ranks also. But merely stating the facts is not enough. We believe that, without pointing at their neighbors, subdivisions of the MVD should first and foremost rid themselves of these diseases, for we are in the front ranks of those fighting them.

[Sorokin] Vadim Viktorovich, the finger has been pointed at you earlier than others: Is it that the ailments are simply more visible in the ranks of the militia and are on public display?

[Bakatin] It is because everyone wishes to see our ranks as beyond reproach. A good wish. Only how to achieve in practice what is desired? We will not idealize what is being done. I will say frankly that we still lack a dependable system of combating social vices.

Today, as we are building a state based on the rule of law, the danger of a slide into the arbitrariness of powerlessness persists. This cannot be allowed, and in order to avoid it, a strong law enforcement system must be energetically created on a firm legal footing.

[Sorokin] Strength and the law. Democracy and compulsion. Are these concepts compatible in practice? After all, one may frequently hear: Let us rely on consciousness and operate without compulsion.

[Bakatin] Such opinions are encountered. I will say this: The arbitrariness of powerlessness is no less, if not more, dangerous than the arbitrariness of power. For this there is a corresponding name—anarchy. That is, lawlessness in the absolute. Disrespect for the authorities, egotism, one individual's domination of another, and disregard for all rights and rules.

To what might this lead? Not to an improvement in affairs in society, of course. So strength and the law, democracy and compulsion do not contradict one another. They are not simply compatible, they are interconnected. It is necessary to view things realistically here, not have one's head in the clouds. Democracy is not an abstract but a concrete concept. Understandably, compulsion should be employed only on the basis of the law and within the framework of the law appropriately to the violations that have been perpetrated. I would employ the well-known formula: maximum of legality—minimum of coercion. But compulsion cannot be rejected in principle.

Fostering respect for the law is impossible without compulsion. Permissiveness and lack of punishment may lead only to negative results. In this case we would never inculcate respect for the law and the established procedure of human community living.

[Sorokin] But are we not currently going through a period when many people do not, as they say, give a hoot for the law?

[Bakatin] At every step. Respect for the law is now, in my opinion, at the lowest level in the history of Soviet power. But who is to blame? We may speak about a misunderstanding of humanization and a certain paralysis of the law enforcement system and about the fact that we are too often looking over our shoulders at public opinion, fearing to use force and power where we should and being afraid of criticism, sometimes from the left, sometimes from the right.

All this is true. But I am convinced that the most important source of lawlessness begins with lack of respect for the country's main law—the Constitution. Most regrettably, this is being demonstrated by the legislators themselves. Legislative enactments are being adopted in the republics all the time that are contrary to the USSR Constitution. This is giving rise to a chain reaction. Provinces, districts, and cities are beginning to talk about "sovereignty". We will soon be down to the village soviet. What kind of respect for the law can be demanded of the citizen under these conditions?

I agree that the state Constitution needs to be revised, and the sooner, the better. But this needs to be done by the legitimate path also, that is, via the country's parliament and the People's Deputies of the USSR Congress. But now everyone considers himself sovereign and the indisputable authority.

Understandably, all is not that simple. Many problems have accumulated, and a search for the best paths of our joint existence is under way. But I am for this search proceeding on the tracks of legality. How can we teach people to respect "ordinary" laws if the main one is being violated?

[Sorokin] What influence have such important social events as the formation of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Communist Party and the 28th CPSU Congress exerted on the work of the MVD authorities? You took part in both party congresses. What is your attitude toward the proposals concerning the depoliticization and de-partyization of the militia, which were heard there?

[Bakatin] It is hardly possible to determine any specific influence. I would say that the party congresses exerted their influence on the militia the same as on society. A highly diverse influence. I personally, like many Communists of our ministry, believe that the creation of the RSFSR Communist Party was a vital necessity. A long-standing illogicality in the structural composition of the CPSU has been removed. And the statehood of the RSFSR should be completed also. A Russian MVD was formed at the start of this year, incidentally. Reality compelled, practice persuaded.

I believe that a sovereign Russia, as a state, will contribute to the integration of all the independent republics and their unification in a single union on new terms corresponding to modern requirements. The republics are primary, and the Union, the result of voluntary association. I believe that it is only on this basis that we will preserve a strong state. The 28th CPSU Congress contributed to the creation of certain prerequisites for this.

I had intended to speak at the congress, but I was not called. I believe that if the party wishes to strengthen its authority in society, it must abandon the customary stereotypes and dogmatic tenets and urgently engage in self-renewal.

The authority of any party is gauged not by the authority of the name of its founders, but by an action program that attracts the masses and enjoys their broad support. Unless this is the case, there will, consequently, be no authority, whatever the party calls itself—"vanguard" or "parliamentary".

Concerning depoliticization and de-partyization, a very destabilizing influence is being exerted by the delay over the law on political parties. But they actually exist and are operating.

Under the conditions of a multiparty system, the MVD, like other state authorities, must change the forms and methods of its work and its organizational structure. Previously we had a common party and state system; one party, and it was the ruling party—everything was clear. Now, given the existence of other parties, the MVD cannot belong to some one of them and, even more, fulfill the instructions of its directive authorities. Nor are there any longer such instructions.

The MVD is a state body and component of the USSR Council of Ministers. We work under the direct leadership of the president.

Talk, however, about a ban on a militia employee being a member of this party or the other is the most outright mockery of human rights. This is nothing other than the notorious "profession bans". Membership of the Communist Party or some other political organization authorized by the law cannot hamper the performance of one's official duties in the law enforcement authorities or anywhere else. And the place where a person is registered with a party is a formal question. I believe that in time all will settle down and find its place. Political work should quit the production sphere. This process should not be pushed and accelerated. Employing command and administrative methods here is pointless.

There is a big party organization of Communists in our country. I am sure that they will perform an important positive role in the restructuring of the MVD system and the enhancement of the efficiency of the law enforcement system. Of course, there are also those who have decided to quit the party ranks. There are not many of them. I do not believe that this is depoliticization. This is "repoliticization". But this is their own business.

[Sorokin] When it is a matter of de-partyization, things are clear. Please specify your positions in respect to depoliticization. You, Vadim Viktorovich, will not, after all, deny that the MVD subdivisions serve a particular policy.

[Bakatin] To be honest, this subject now sets my teeth on edge. The law enforcement authorities serve only the law. But the law cannot fail to reflect policy.

And depoliticization under modern conditions is a bluff. Raising in a politicized society a depoliticized personality is an impossibility. Setting such a task means closing one's eyes to reality and indulging in complacent daydreaming.

Prohibiting service in the militia on account of one's beliefs is McCarthyism and medievalism.

But, despite everything, the government will, for all that, under the conditions of a multiparty society, be formed from the political party that is victorious at elections. This is what happens in all democratic countries. And the government will pursue the policy of this party, relying on its support.

However, no ruling party can operate outside the framework of the law. It cannot violate constitutional provisions. And for this reason there is no contradiction in the politicization of the state authorities either. If all is legitimate, what is criminal? The law is identical for all.

That our history has demonstrated numerous other examples is a different matter. And we cannot, or are unwilling to, believe that new times are here.

Multiparty conditions are not dangerous for our society, as they are not for any other. It is a normal, natural state. But whereas for a normal democratic society anticommunism is not dangerous either, militant anticommunism is today for us the main destabilizing factor. And, if we wish to pass through all transformations without upheavals, we should not dart from one extreme to another. Nothing will come of this.

[Sorokin] MVD subdivisions are having to participate in a normalization of interethnic conflicts. What position, as minister and a member of the Presidential Council, do you occupy?

[Bakatin] We are frequently rebuked: MVD subdivisions are late in extinguishing interethnic conflagrations. We were late in Fergana and Osh, say. But what; should we, perhaps, have dispatched Internal Troops there in advance? And what would this have done? Would it not have incited conflict even earlier?

Immediately station troops in advance everywhere, perhaps, and let them remain just in case? We could only delay a conflict and put it on hold, but not eliminate it.

The causes of interethnic conflict are being explained increasingly often today by social conditions and an exacerbation of demographic processes and the environment. But it is forgotten that these factors also were present earlier, but did not bring about conflicts. What does it mean? That a new factor—nationalism—has been added. It is this against the background of all social disorders that strikes the first spark. And, however we may try, the MVD alone cannot cope with nationalism.

Shifting the burden of responsibility for interethnic conflicts onto the law enforcement authorities is unfair. I would add that the militia also is infected with nationalism to a considerable extent.

The problem needs to be solved primarily by political methods. But we are as yet embarrassed at openly and plainly acknowledging that nationalism really exists and we look for roundabout phrases. Political evaluations are not made. We look for the instigators among hooligans, although it is obvious that the former are nationalists. This is, after all, inveterate nationalism, when one people looks for persons to blame for its troubles among another people.

Such are the conflicts in Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Kirghizia. Twice already the Meskhetian Turks have been left utterly destitute, and no one is to blame.

We cannot reduce everything to particular instances: sometimes it is land that has not been shared, sometimes water. But the root of the evil lies elsewhere. I believe that a renewal of the Union and a new Union treaty would lay a foundation beneath a specific solution of the problems of interethnic relations on the basis of democracy.

[Sorokin] You are comparatively new in the MVD system. Do you like your work or are you performing your official duty? How do you evaluate the regular officers of the militia—their professional training and devotion to the cause?

[Bakatin] I have been working for 30 years, since I graduated from the institute. A construction worker by trade. And to be honest, I derived my greatest satisfaction when I was a works superintendent. And becoming a construction worker was no accident: romance called—the so-called "construction sites of communism" were getting under way at that time. It was interesting. I was then promoted to party work: I became enthusiastic about this also. Perhaps I was wrong and have changed, but I do not regret the years spent in both Kemerovo and Kirov Oblasts.

And now the militia. I will not say that the position of minister is the most difficult. The work of the militia officer is, for all that, the most difficult. One good man said: "Spend a day in a militia officer's shoes—you will see another side of life." This is, indeed, true: only negative emotions, anomalies, stresses, brutality and boorishness. Constant danger.

Work around the clock. For some people a holiday, for the militia officer, an accelerated version of his work.

There is no boredom in this work, there are more than enough problems. Both difficult and interesting. Our personnel is, as everywhere, varied. Faultless people. But the main problem is that initiative has been suppressed, and there is insufficient habituation to independent work and creativity. And no good comes of this.

[Sorokin] Vadim Viktorovich, you are, to all appearances, a person with easy enthusiasms.

[Bakatin] Perhaps. Even unduly emotional, perhaps. But I believe that an active attitude toward life, toward all its problems, is needed. There is no business that does not concern the militia. Crime is the main thing, of course. But if there is no tobacco, look into it: Is it just a question of bungling? The disaster in Chernobyl is our disaster. There is a logjam at the customs—we are to blame. Vegetables are not being transported—why? In our work indifference is intolerable.

Our people are, as I said, varied. The vast majority are true workers and professionals. But the professional level needs to be raised constantly: This is dictated by reality. Much is having to be renamed: What has always been good is today no longer satisfactory. So personnel is the number one issue.

[Sorokin] Do you have any time left over for personal, family life? What is the situation on this front? What are your predilections and favorite pastimes? Are you content in yourself and with your lot and fate?

[Bakatin] Seemingly simple questions, but answering them is not easy. It is always difficult to speak about personal matters, we are unaccustomed to this. Were I to say that all is normal, I would, consequently, be evading the answer. The family, as a family, is not without its problems. But we tackle them ourselves, together. And, generally, ours is an amicable family.

But I have few predilections and pastimes aside from work. I was considered a hockey enthusiast and once played at the amateur level. I am now similarly a fan of tennis. I like books, old jazz, and a good folk song. It is just that there is not enough time for all this. I really forget about all else when I am painting.

[Sorokin] Please tell us about your roots

[Bakatin] It is difficult tracing my family tree. My grandfather was a Siberian, from Biysk, a teacher. He was executed in Tomsk in 1937. Thus the roots were severed. I also, like he and my father—a mining engineer—was born, lived, and worked in Siberia, in Kemerovo Oblast. And on my mother's side (my mother was a doctor), from a peasant family. Her father, A.F. Kulikov, was a professional artist. He died in Moscow in 1949. He was a good Russian.

My wife is a doctor. We have two sons and now two daughters-in-law and two grandsons. Everything normal.

[Sorokin] Have you built your own life or agreed with the way in which it has taken shape?

[Bakatin] No, I have not intentionally ordered my life but have not swum with the tide. I have simply worked. The choice was not always up to me. Such were the times. Even now various offers are being made, but I have a composed attitude toward this.

[Sorokin] At the elections of the president of the USSR and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, incidentally, your name was cited. Why did you stand down?

[Bakatin] I do not believe that I am better equipped than other candidates to fulfill these duties. I occupy the responsible office of minister and have as yet done far from all that I have in mind. I am not sore at fate and am not controled by ambition. And, then, in the last five years I have changed jobs four times: How much more? It is time to quit rushing about. And the situation in the MVD is more complex now than ever. It cannot be abandoned.

[Sorokin] What have you wanted to sincerely ask yourself in order to candidly answer a question that I have not anticipated?

[Bakatin] I am tormented by the question of why we are unable to live in peace here in our own country. But I am not finding a clear answer to it. We need to do all within our power to preserve and renew the Union. Egotism and embitterment cannot determine the way of life. Perestroyka must exert its healing influence on the relations of people, and peoples also. There can be no swimming with the tide here; it is essential to specifically arrange relations in society on the basis of laws and lofty morals and ethics. We must become wiser and more tolerant of one another.

Arbatov Accuses Critics of 'McCarthyism'

90UF0541A Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English 26 Aug 90 p 13

[Article by Aleksey Arbatov, doctor of historical sciences: "Others Have Been Through It Before"—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] There is a lot of criticism of this country's leadership for "losing" Eastern Europe and undermining the USSR's "security structures" as a result of the revolutions on our Western borders. On closer inspection, however, one can't help noting a certain false premise in this debate. The changes in the USSR's national security structures are by no means the main grievance of state party and military leaders.

A sensitive and historically painful sphere of our life, national security is being used not so much against the present leadership as against its domestic policies.

Such a situation brings to mind the beginning of McCarthyism, a shameful page in the U.S. history. On the turn of the 1950s, the division of Germany and Europe by the "iron curtain" and the defeat of the American protege Chang Kaishi in China fuelled a powerful offensive by reactionary forces in the States led by Sen. Joseph McCarthy.

His explanation of the social and political changes around the world was simple: the State Department and the federal government had been penetrated by Communists and Soviet agents. Because of them the United States lost China and other countries; the American empire created as a result of the World War II was threatened, the U.S. "Defence perimeter" violated, etc.

Present-day allegations about the USSR ceding ideological priority to the West, being "ousted" from Europe, and losing the GDR are similar in tone. Historical analogies are always tentative, because the times and the circumstances change fast. Yet there is an important similarity here. Now, as then, complicated and irreversible processes in other countries are neither accepted nor understood, but above all are used to check the democratic forces at home by accusing them of high treason.

Now in this country some people allege that the fruits of WWII, paid for with enormous Soviet losses are being forfeited. Did millions upon millions of our compatriots really give their lives merely for the sake of Stalin's empire? No, they died to save their homeland and to liberate Europe of fascism. In 1945, the European nations welcomed Soviet troops as liberators. Heavy blows to the political and moral prestige of that great victory were dealt in the late 1940s, in 1956 and 1968, when the peoples of Eastern Europe began viewing their liberators as new occupants and oppressors.

The first and the main error was committed then, not now: we lost the historic chance of setting up a zone of real security in Europe relying on independent and friendly countries maintaining equal and mutually beneficial relations with the USSR.

Critics say we have lost our Warsaw Treaty allies. But if they were really our allies, they have the right, if they no longer need our protection, to demand a withdrawal of our troops. We ought to be glad that the burden of defence spending and of foreign commitments is diminishing. But if we intended to "defend" other nations against their will, the terms "allies," and "alliance" do not do justice to the nature of our relationship.

Those who are openly regretting the fact that our armies "are leaving East Europe without a fight" **should as openly declare what they mean by such a "fight."** Perhaps, another "Afghan affair" with immeasurably greater human losses? Let those "patriots" then explain how the Soviet Union can afford such a campaign morally, economically and politically, in terms of both domestic and worldwide repercussions.

Finally, as for the military aspect, what used to be taken for granted has long been subject to question. What was the idea of deploying more than half a million troops on the "front lines" if the need to defend our allies from a NATO attack was improbable? Perhaps our idea was to conquer the rest of Europe, if need be? But such an idea is both militarily and politically absurd.

Perhaps, we sought to push our "defence perimeter" further off, like we did in 1939 and 1940? The military fruits of that strategy were reaped in June 1941. The questionable support of our allies had always been a major factor in NATO's strategic planning which outweighed the Warsaw Treaty Organization's considerable advantage in conventional armaments.

Are our top brass unaware of this? Hardly. Also, in the era of long-range nuclear missiles, the military and technical expediency of such "buffers" seems dubious.

Perhaps our strategic objective was simply to intimidate the West with an armoured fist in its face? In this case, our strategy has been most successful. As a result, we got NATO, a powerful U.S. presence on the continent, thousands of American, British and French nuclear missiles surrounding us, and a militarily integrated West Europe.

The objective processes going on in Europe may well grate on our nerves. We would rather West Germany seek to join the GDR, and West Europe beg to be admitted to CMEA, that European NATO countries press the United States to withdraw its troops from their territories, and the U.S. turn to the Soviet Union for loans and wheat.

But the reality is different, and we would do well to accept this difference as the root cause of all our problems. All the tanks, missiles, and divisions in the world cannot resolve these problems. They can be swept under the carpet (as was done for decades), but historically speaking, the postwar defence structure has always been doomed and "seismically dangerous." Sooner or later it was bound to collapse.

Now, at long last, the postwar period of history has ended in Europe, and a new phase has begun. The elimination of the USSR's military-political dominance in Eastern Europe will inevitably be followed by a withdrawal or radical reduction of the American presence in Europe. The military aspect of European integration will, to a great extent, depend on Soviet military policy and our position at arms talks.

Psychologically, one can well understand the anxieties, objections and complaints by those used to the status quo, especially because the basically correct policy of troop withdrawal runs into our usual problems of inefficiency and disorganization (I mean, in particular, the lack of housing and bases for the military returning home, and jobs for the demobbed). But we are not the first or the last to experience such a radical transformation in relation to the states we have got into the habit of ruling politically, economically, and militarily. History tells us that many great powers in the past managed to recover after such upheavals, eventually restoring their position in the world system on new principles, reinforcing their security, and finding ways to ensure their national interests.

Also, the domestic situation in those countries eventually improved, the prestige of their military was enhanced as an indispensable element in ensuring national security.

Therefore, we would do well to try and weather this painful period with dignity, to rationalize its roots and to build our relations with a new Europe on a new basis. At present, an unprecedented variety of opportunities are opening up for our continent to become a zone of security and cooperation instead of a bridgehead of confrontation. We must not allow conservative forces in the USSR to push our policy at this crucial moment on a ruinous course whose consequences for the Soviet Union's national interests would be fatal.

Sunday Newspapers Not Delivered in Some Cities

PM2809120190

[Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 28 September in its Second Edition carries on page 1 under the headline "And Yet It Has All Been Paid For..." a TASS-attributed photograph showing two old women looking at numerous bound copies of newspapers, including PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA, lying on a sidewalk. The caption to the photograph reads: "In many cities newspapers are no longer delivered on Sundays. It seems that the postal workers have seen this as a signal for exerting further pressure on subscribers. Clearly, the next step is to shorten the newspaper week and force journalists to abandon Sunday issues altogether. These latest newspaper issues are what greet you at Post Office No. 68, in downtown Perm. And yet the subscribers have paid for all this."

International Journalists Center Founded

LD2709215490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1038 GMT 27 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 27 September (TASS)—TASS correspondent Oleg Polovko reports:

Vladimir Mezentsev, chairman of the International Journalists Center [IJC] registered today in Moscow, defined its main goals as breaking "the information blockade" around the activities of the country's democratic forces, uniting progressive-thinking journalists, and genuinely defending their rights. He was speaking here at a news conference at the opening of the center. The new public organization is an alternative to the USSR Union of Journalists and the international organization of journalists. Its members can be either Soviet citizens or foreigners—it is sufficient to apply for membership. Unlike in official organizations, journalists in the IJC will not pay subscriptions. The IJC will exist on means obtained by its own activities—publishing the newspaper 'Reporter,' holding various large-scale events, and also with the help of its sponsor—the airline "Pan-American."

Apart from this, the IJC chairman reported, by using the support of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Committee on the Mass Media, public organizations, and mass citizen movements and by examining public opinion, the IJC has instituted the 'journalists of Russia' fund. The fund will help in developing the democratic press and the other mass media, and provide specific material and financial help to editorial offices and for the creation of a joint-stock bank for developing the Russian press. The question of using the fund's income will be submitted by the IJC to the above-mentioned Russian Supreme Soviet committee for examination, Vladimir Mezentsev said.

Press Leaders Hold Meeting on Independent Press

LD2809225690 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 28 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow September 28 TASS—Representatives of some 30 independent newspapers and other publications from around the Soviet Union met in Moscow today to discuss ways to promote democratic reforms in the country.

The round-table discussion was organised by the MOSCOW NEWS newspaper.

The meeting aims to promote unity among the independent press, which has been put in a difficult situation by the Communist Party and economic reforms, MOSCOW NEWS Editor-in-Chief Yegor Yakovlev said in his opening remarks.

He suggested setting up an association of independent press in the Soviet Union. The association will pass information between independent publications during preparations for a "forum of democratic forces" and will work against the press that wants to discredit democratic publications, Yakovlev said.

The association should show the public that the independent press is a inter-acting force to be reckoned with, he said.

Writers Union Leader Interviewed on Problems

LD2809180590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1420 GMT on 28 September carries the 10-minute unscheduled "Topical Interview" program, in which V.V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers Union, is interviewed by Ninel Shakhova.

Asked to comment on the issue of certain journalists' affiliation to the Writers Union, Karpov says that it is a bad thing when the law is not obeyed, and even worse when people can get away with not obeying the law. Newspapers are supposed to register themselves; if the founders relinquish the newspaper, the labor collective can become the founder.

The USSR State Committee for the press, Karpov continues, which has been charged with registering newspapers, has refused to register some newspapers. The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Ministry of Press Information, however has been registering everything, both Union and republican organs.

"Either they are such kind people, or, I don't know, accomplices of those who want to register," he says jokingly.

Karpov notes that some labor collectives want editorial independence. This is fine, but they are "seizing" newspapers and this is "nonsense".

Karpov holds up a copy of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA and says that the newspaper has announced that it has been registered by the RSFSR ministry. He cites a mass of telegrams protesting this registration, which constitutes the "stealing or separation of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA." Karpov's view is that the labor collective has founded a new RSFSR newspaper, and has no legal right to the status of a Union newspaper, and must give back the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA: "If they do not give it back, then we will have to take them to court." Karpov thinks that "probably we will convene" a plenum of the Writers Union on this issue. Shakhova asks Karpov to respond to LITERATURNAYA GAZETS'S claims regarding income from the newspaper. Karpov says that the Writers Union "took, in addition to 33 percent, 50 million rubles [R] in 1988-89. What bad people we are!" He then goes on to explain what the money was spent on: R7 million on pensions, R17 million on housing construction, maintenance of clinics, "houses of creativity," business trips, R1.6 million on a literature institute, R240,000 on LITERATURNOYE OBOZRENIYE, R57,000 on SOVREMENNAYA DRAMATURGIYA, R150,000 on TEATR, and R120,000 on VOPROSY LITERATURY. The fact that this does not add up to R50 million is not mentioned. Rounding off, Karpov says, "so, if they allow this, then this is even a question of the fate of the Union. And the Writers Union could fall apart."

KGB Officials, Propaganda Workers Meet

LD2909161890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 29 Sep 90

[Text] A meeting between KGB officials and propaganda workers opened today in the USSR KGB's center of public relations. This marked the beginning of the new school year in the political education system. The new teachers learned many new things about the present day state security bodies. Activities in intelligence and counterintelligence and the fight against terrorism were discussed.

But those present were most interested in the fight against organized crime. The KGB officials admitted that the results could be better, but to be fair it must be said that there have been certain successes. Last year 300 criminal groups were eliminated. Damages of 170 million rubles were returned to the state. Some of the future plans of the KGB's activities in this field were discussed.

Ryazan Makes Solzhenitsyn Honorary Citizen

90P50121 Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Sep 90 p 1

[Report by V. Gorodetskiy: "Honorary Citizen of Ryazan"]

[Text] Ryazan—**The presidium of the Ryazan City Soviet of People's Deputies confered the title of honorary citizen on the Russian writer Aleksandr Isayevich Solzhenitsyn.**

For many years the life and work of Solzhenitsyn were associated with this city on the river Oka. Here he worked as a teacher after the camps and exile. Here were born the famous "A Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich," "Cancer Ward" and many other works.

Foreign Ships To Use Northern Sea Route

LD3009205990 Murmansk Maritime Press Service in Russian 1430 GMT 30 Sep 90

[Summary] The Murmansk Shipping Line intends to start taking general cargo to the Far East along the Northern Sea Route using ice-strengthened ships from July to October. Atomic icebreakers will only be used in case of necessity. The route is ten days shorter than via the Suez Canal. The shipping line might also organize the convoying of foreign ships through the Artic.

New Trade Union Organizations Formed

LD2909194190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Sep 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The result of two Trade Union congresses in Moscow was the formation of the USSR Federation of Trade Unions of Workers of Commerce, Public Catering and Consumer Cooperation and the All-Union Federation of Trade Unions of Staff of the Timber Industry.

Laid-Off Kaliningrad Seaman Seek Foreign Employ

PM2509134190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Sep 90

[Report by S. Chekalin in Kaliningrad; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Chekalin] Now we have collected the questionnaires, what are your aims?

[Unidentified man] The aim is to work abroad.

[Chekalin] Why have you decided to do that?

[Unidentified man] Because I want to earn some money, that's all.

[Chekalin] How much does a middling maritime specialist earn in the West?

[Unidentified man, sitting at table] As far as I know, according to the figures given by MORSKOY EKSPRESS that I recently caught sight of, something on the order of $1,500.

[Chekalin] Have you also come to apply?

[Unidentified man] Yes, I also want to have a go at working on foreign ships.

[Chekalin] How much did you earn working here?

[Second man] On average 400 rubles, at sea.

[Chekalin] Our fleet is growing old. It lacks ships. Some 1,300 maritime specialists—that is the surplus of maritime cadres in Leningrad alone. Another 1,000 seamen are beached, as they say, that is, ashore, in reserve, sometimes waiting up to a year or more for a voyage. The new training center should give the seamen the chance to retrain for work on ships belonging to other countries. What will they be studying.

[L.Ye. Naumov, general director of the all-Union Center] We will above all learn English—in-depth and working language—with a little bit of maritime law, international maritime law, a little bit of marketing, the fundamentals of marketing and management, and commercial practice,

[Chekalin] Are there many takers?

[Naumov] A very great many.

[Chekalin] We realize that we are selling our working force; this was brought about by the momentum of the approaching market. What do you as a seamen feel, so to speak?

[Naumov] Normal feelings. The point is that our seamen were isolated for a very long time from foreign maritime technology. For that reason we lagged considerably in our provision of modern equipment for ships and in the ability to work with this equipment. We must now make up for that, and this will be no easy matter, but it must be done because all progress—including in maritime work—comes from pooling rather than dividing efforts.

Seismic Tests Mistaken for Earth Tremors

LD2909214190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1925 GMT 29 Sep 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Precisely three months ago Dimitrovgrad was twice shaken by underground tremors. The following day a wave of rumor and panic spread throughout Ulyanovsk oblast—not surprising, since just a few kilometers away is the big Atomic Reactors Institute, with its underground store of liquid waste.

In the past few days the tension has been relieved by a government commission, which has named the true culprit. It transpires that on 14 and 28 June a seismic expedition from Sverdlovsk conducted two powerful explosions 1.5 km from Dimitrovgrad with the aim of studying the Earth's mantle. These explosions were assumed to be earth tremors.

And so, the Atomic Agency has been rehabilitated. But the questions remain: how could it be that mighty explosions such as these could have been conducted without anybody—neither the town nor the oblast authorities, nor even the competent bodies—knowing about it? And given this cavalier attitude, what could we be in for tomorrow?

[S. Semenychev, from the Atomic Reactors Institute] After what we have been through, nothing could surprise us now. Not even the fact that the oblast executive committee granted permission for these explosions a month after they occurred.

'American' Business University To Open

90US1329A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Sep 90 p 2

[Report of an interview with former Soviet physicist Eduard Lozanskiy by A. Amlinskiy; place and date not given: "With a View to Moscow—The American University Opened"]

[Text] Eduard Lozanskiy is a former Soviet physicist. In the 1970's his scientific career was interrupted due to what now would be very moderate comments concerning the invasion of Prague by Soviet troops and also about the persecution of A.D. Sakharov.

In 1976 he was given the choice of either leaving for the West or going in the opposite direction. He chose the first option, which brought him to the United States. But there was one circumstance that gave an acute touch of drama to the situation. Eduard Lozanskiy's wife, Tatyana, was the daughter of one of the generals who had designed and put into operation the idea of the invasion into Czechoslovakia. She was "detained" in Moscow. For six years the family fought to be reunited. The struggle had a happy ending. Later a book was written which became a bestseller. They became a successful American family and seemed to lose any active ties to Russia. But they did keep up ties because of Eduard's and Tatyana's actions and the work of the group they created to defend Sakharov.

In 1988 Lozanskiy was invited to Moscow for negotiations. They needed his help to carry out a number of scientific projects. This time he came with a very concrete idea:

[Lozanskiy] It occurred to me a long time ago to create an American university in Moscow. At first, before glasnost and perestroyka, I thought of it as something that had to be done underground. American experts and professors used to come to the USSR and they would read their lectures in a Moscow apartment remembering, meanwhile, to preserve the secrecy and to watch out for the ever-vigilant KGB. This work continued for some two or three years.

Later we sensed that the situation in the USSR had started to change dramatically. We decided to make our activity legal and to expand the number of our listeners, who previously consisted mainly of the opposition and radical young intellectuals. To check on the feasibility of the university concept we decided to conduct a certain test—to hold a conference in Moscow under the name: "Understanding the Values of Western Civilization." It took place last spring. We wanted to gather people with very harsh views of the Soviet reality, as well as some skeptics from the American intellectual elite, and to set up a direct dialog between them and the Soviet public.

Some "double-dyed hawks" came and spoke about things that were "terrible" from the point of view of Soviet orthodoxy. But everything went exceptionally well. The people here and, what is more important the people in the United States, believed that an American university in the USSR was not a utopia. Major American foundations agreed to sponsor our enterprise.

[Amlinskiy] What kind of a university is it? What kind of existence do you foresee for it in the USSR?

[Lozanskiy] Our main goal is to have, in two or three years, a separate building in Moscow whose sign would make it known that this is a higher educational establishment of the United States of America.

[Amlinskiy] Are you not afraid that you will have to design right away a special place for those people who would line up thinking that this is the new U.S. Embassy building and that from here they could go straight overseas?

[Lozanskiy] I hope that in this building a Soviet person will be able to acquire something more important than an entrance visa. I hope it will be the diploma of an American college. This would mean that his education was on a world level.

[Amlinskiy] Tell me, what do you need it for?

[Lozanskiy] That is a logical question. It might seem that we are trying to corrupt the pure young Soviet people with our Western novelties or that we are preparing a Western expansion into the USSR. Or maybe I am bluffing on a grandiose scale, trying to settle my personal financial problems?

There is no one answer to this. When we started all this we had nothing but headaches. We had to persuade people, to invent things, to find financing for our ideas. We are not making any money on this, by the way—the education in the university will be free.

Everybody insists that Russia is in such a terrifying, seemingly bottomless hole that it will need another hundred years to get out of it. I categorically disagree with this notion. Whatever is being suggested now by your and our economists, it is so clear and natural, so much attuned to the human nature that only a few years will be necessary to raise the country to some starting level. After that the perspectives are even difficult to talk about, they are so breathtaking.

[Amlinskiy] Could you be building castles in the air?

[Lozanskiy] Last year I promised myself that on 1 September the new stage of the university would start, that it would begin functioning. We decided that at first it will be a year-long school of business with American professors lecturing there. If we see that things are going well during the year and something is needed, I hope we will collect enough money to invite new students next year.

[Amlinskiy] How many students do you plan to enroll this year?

[Lozanskiy] Sixty people. The thing is that we will have group seminars, apart from the lectures which can be attended by everybody. The professors demand that a group have no more than 20 students.

[Amlinskiy] What is the selection principle? I hope you are not going to only accept those who have proper connections.

[Lozanskiy] We have a test given to American students when they enroll in a business school. In the USSR the tests usually have some brain-racking mathematical problems which you cannot solve unless you are a genius or have had private coaching. The American system uses a different approach: A businessman or an economist does not have to be a brilliant mathematician, but he should know how to make fast and exact decisions.

[Amlinskiy] I think that our students should also be altruistic to a certain degree and not only your professors. They might be tempted, after receiving an excellent education, to try themselves out in places where the market economy is a reality and not still an abstract word in a newspaper.

[Lozanskiy] If people are allowed to leave the USSR freely this probably will happen. But there is nothing terrible about a person gaining some experience and coming back to his home country. Besides, many people in the USSR have certain illusions as they forget the thousands of universities which exist in the United States.

An expert prepared by us, with his rare if not unique profession, will face incredible opportunities in the conditions of the new economic system. We hope that our future students who, by the way, will get the opportunity to practice in the United States, will aim primarily to open their own businesses here and to become pioneers of Soviet business.

From the editor: As this article was being written the first test took place. Out of 1,200 people (20 people per vacancy) 200 were selected. The second test—in English—awaits them. Let us remind you: Sixty people will become students at the university.

No-Confidence Vote Adopted at Academy of Sciences

LD2809215490 Moscow TASS in English 2043 GMT 28 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow September 29 TASS—Delegates of scientists working at various institutions of the USSR Academy of Sciences and members of its public organisations passed a no-confidence vote for leadership of the Academy of Sciences. On Friday they sent a statement to the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences to demand urgent measures in connection with the "crisis in fundamental sciences and uncertainty about organisation of scientific work at the present stage in the USSR." The delegation was received by vice-president of the Academy of Sciences Vladimir Kudryavtsev.

The statement emphasises the need for participation of representatives of the academy's research institutions in managing science and their inclusion in the academy's supreme executive body—the general meeting. The statement demands that a congress of the Academy of Sciences be shortly convened.

Vice-President Kudryavtsev supported the idea of the participation of scientists' representatives in managing science. He proposed that a mechanism for interaction be created. The vice-president also agreed that an organisational committee should be formed to hold a meeting of scientists of the academy.

The meeting also discussed a clause of the decree of the Soviet president about the status of the Academy of Sciences related to the improvement of scientists' material position. Kudryavtsev assured the delegates that the increase of salaries of scientists will not be accompanied by reductions in institutions of the Academy of Sciences. Additional financing will draw on the funds of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Kudryavtsev and members of the delegation agreed that working groups of scientists' representatives be set up for interaction with leaders of the Academy of Sciences in tackling important issues.

Shcherbakov Opens Socioeconomic Studies University

LD2809192390 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT 28 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 28 TASS—"Plans for the transition to a market economy", "sociology and personnel policy in new conditions", and other issues are on the curriculum of the Soviet University of Socioeconomic Studies and Personnel Policy that has just opened in Moscow.

The university was founded by the Soviet State Committee on Labour and Social Issues, the Znaniye Society and the Intertraining Association for Business Cooperation with Foreign Countries in Specialist Training.

The university has been set up to make it easier for industrial managers and economists to adapt to a free-market, Intertraining General Director Vladimir Sukharev told TASS.

The university will invite both Soviet and Western specialists. Its students will visit several leading European firms.

Opening the first class in Moscow's Hall of Columns Vladimir Shcherbakov, chairman of the Soviet Committee on Labour and Social Issues, spoke about social aspects of the transition to a market economy, problems it might cause and possible mistakes.

Francois Berthoud, director of the Paris Exhibition Committee spoke about the use of modern technologies in production management.

Other speakers included Anatoliy Milyukov, head of the Presidential Economic and Social Development Forecasting Department and sociologist Igor Bestuzhev-Lada.

Economic

Ryzhkov Advocates U.S. Economic Example

LD0110170390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1240 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Esteemed radio listeners, we now present the program "Law and Economic Cooperation" for your attention. A major Soviet-U.S. conference with this name has recently been held in Moscow. At the microphone is Anatoliy Fedorov, all-Union radio correspondent.

[Fedorov] [passage omitted] To conclude the program, a word from Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and William Rogers, the former U.S. secretary of state and chairman of the organizational committee on the American side:

[Begin recording] [Reporter] Nikolay Ivanovich, what specific results can be expected from such an important forum?

[Ryzhkov] I think that for us what is most topical of all just now is the legal aspect of the transition to a market economy. This is the first thing. And the second thing is the organization of the state. Those are two matters that interest us very much, and we will do everything to familiarize ourselves to a certain extent with the work of the American legal experts. As far as the transition to a market economy is concerned, in my view we have a very weak infrastructure.

I know the real situation. Just look: We set up cooperatives two years ago. It seemed to be a good thing. It was the first step toward a market economy. But it was not properly backed up, not reinforced by a legal basis. And today we have a great many negative trends. I think that this conference which will take place will give us the opportunity to properly weigh it and to really set up a very strong legal foundation. I think that Mr. Rogers was right when he said that we are transferring to a market economy, transferring to an essentially new system of economic and social relations, and there must be a very strong juridical basis.

And they [the United States] have two hundred years of experience in the life of a federal state. They have gone through traumas and we, anyway, must once more exchange opinions, look, think how their things are ordered on the legal principles of a federal state. You know that not everything is fine with us in this respect. Centrifugal forces are developing in the country. Supremacy of republican laws over Union laws will not, in my view, benefit the country's normal life. Therefore, we must consider, look, familarize ourselves very seriously with how their system is arranged.

[Reporter] What question can there be of a transition to a market economy when 60 articles of the criminal code pull all this back, and do not give room for expanison?

[Ryzhkov] The criminal code must be reviewed. Many new laws must be adopted. But, in adopting new laws, we must constantly value the old laws as well. So, there is an enormous task ahead for the legal experts.

[Reporter] Nikolay Ivanovich, one last question. We are, after all, dreamers. When we were born, when man appeared on the earth, he dreamed of a bright future, a better future. If you had a—I don't know—a magic wand or something, what would you take from U.S. experience immediately for us for our sick economy, to repair it?

[Ryzhkov] First, I would take their laws, which regulate their whole economic life, very accurately. And second, without giving it a second thought, I would take small-scale enterprise, because everything else requires a very great amount of time. Do not think that it will take a year or two. And, of course, the people's psychology must be changed.

Just look: He [former secretary Rogers] spoke on the rostrum this morning and he spoke about money, about profit, did he not? Yes! In the final analysis we must also teach the people that we can only live better when we earn more, when this pie will be bigger. Then we will be able to divide it. They [the Americans] are taught this from infancy. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Sobchak Notes Unions' Role in Market Transition

LD2809020190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Sep 90

[Text] The position of the trade unions in the transition to a market economy was discussed at the plenum of the Leningrad Oblast Trade Union Council. Sobchak, chairman of the Leningrad City Soviet, explained the special features of such a transition to a market economy, establishing a free economic zone in the city. He noted that Leningrad enterprises will mostly change to employing on the basis of contracts, which will deprive trade unions of the right to impose a ban on dismissing workers. The chairman of the Leningrad City Soviet appealed to the trade union committees not to act as initiators of strikes which would, in this complex period for the city and the country, only deepen the crisis situation.

The plenum instructed the presidium of the Leningrad Oblast Trade Union Council to work out and conclude agreements between trade unions and people's deputy soviets intensifying the policy of social protection of the workers in the period of the transition to market economy. It should provide for indexation of wages, pensions, savings in relation to the inflation rate, the introduction of unemployment benefits, and concrete measures to satisfy the consumer market with, first and foremost, basic necessity goods.

RSFSR Free Trade Union Congress Opens

904F0258A Moscow TRUD in Russian 19 Sep 90 p 1

[Unattributed article: "The Trade Unions of Russia: Program of Action"]

[Text] The Constituent Congress of Trade Unions of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] continued after a six-month interruption.

Introduced for discussion by the delegates were: A program and tactics of action for independent trade unions of the RSFSR during the upcoming period; supplements and amendments to the Basic Principles of the organizational structure and activities of the FNPR [Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia]; a draft of an RSFSR law "On Legal Guarantees of Trade Union Activity"; a draft of a Declaration of the Rights of

Workers in the RSFSR; a draft of an agreement between the FNPR Council and the RSFSR government; and other documents.

I.Ye. Klochkov, chairman of the FNPR, gave the report "On the Course of Forming the FNPR and a Program of its Actions."

Delegates and guests of the congress took part in debates.

The congress continues today.

Union Leader Addresses RSFSR Unions Congress

904F0258B Moscow TRUD in Russian
19 Sep 90 pp 1-2

["Abridged" report by I. Klochkov, chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of the RSFSR]

[Text] The main stimulus for decisive and irreversible changes in the trade union movement was the mass dissatisfaction of millions of Russia's workers with the fact that their daily concerns and their socioeconomic interests were increasingly becoming irrelevant to the historical process.

But the interests of the working man must be in the **foreground** and at the **center** of all restructuring and reform. This task has been proclaimed from high tribunals. But it has not been felt in the labor collectives and the families. The people have wearied of waiting and have prepared themselves to struggle. A renewed working movement has proclaimed itself at the top of its voice in Russia. The working man is looking to his trade unions with a gaze that is critical and yet, one might say, expresses a last hope—will they be able to change from a mute appendage of the former system into a combative, decisive, powerful force for his defense?

We assembled for our Russian congress in March with this in mind. We assembled not merely to shake up our movement, which had become inert and predictable, but to begin in essence a new chapter in its history. At that time we adopted a most important and fundamental ruling which was dictated by the circumstances of the moment—concerning the **independent** status of our federation.

Our efforts were mainly directed at the material aspects of the life of the working family, aspects that have turned out to be affected particularly negatively in the course of the deep reforms underway in the country.

At a recent meeting with B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, and at negotiations that took place on 12 September between the leadership of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of the RSFSR [FNPR] and the RSFSR Government, headed by I.S. Silayev, we clearly stated our readiness and desire to cooperate with the supreme organs of the legislative and executive power of Russia in everything that concerns the daily aspects of life and the economic and social interests of the people. To cooperate—loyally or, where necessary, in the spirit of a constructive opposition.

The inconsistency, half-heartedness, and indecisiveness of the central governmental organs, including the Union's Council of Ministers and the searches for so-called "models" and "variants" of further economic and social development of the USSR have not led to any positive achievements. The response to the decline in the standard of living, the growing anarchy in society, and the nonfulfillment of laws has been the legitimate strike actions by miners and fishermen and heated demands from oil industry workers, sailors, railway workers, and other important sectors of the republic's working class.

At our congress we wish to stress that the FNPR is not an opponent or a contractor, it is not the rival of the dozens and dozens of labor and strike committees at the local level; it is their ally and companion-in-arms in the common cause of fighting for the interests of those who work.

* * *

The market—this word is on everyone's tongue today. Every family, every work team, pensioners, students, housewives, and even children are all discussing the same question: What do people expect from the transition to new models of economic life?

In the opinion of the FNPR, we must begin with the main thing—we must candidly explain to the people what the transition to a market will bring, we must honestly identify its benefits and drawbacks, and we must precisely designate the negative consequences that are virtually inevitable at the transitional stage. This is why the presidium and then the plenums of the FNPR Council have demanded publication of genuine calculations of the minimum consumer budget in order to ensure a guaranteed subsistence level.

A few days ago the RSFSR Supreme Soviet approved the "500 days" program, which envisions an exit from the crisis by way of a broad transition to market relations. The FNPR is energetically studying this important package of documents. An initial expert evaluation prepared by a group of economists commissioned by the FNPR confirms the radical nature of the program with regard to both deadlines and the package of draft bills. It seems to us that it is a decisive step after many months of marching in place and, perhaps, an effective instrument for healing our sick economy.

We do not reject the ideas of the "500 days" program, but we consider it necessary to consult with our member organizations, go to the primary organizations, hear out and summarize all opinions, doubts, conclusions, and proposals, and ensure that they are taken into account and implemented.

Numerous messages coming to us from the local level and delegates to the congress are expressing serious alarm and concern over the fact that the RSFSR

Supreme Soviet hastily approved the program without explaining its basic provisions to the masses of the people.

The FNPR Council has firmly spoken in favor of a system of negotiations, treaties, and agreements between the trade unions and the economic administrative organs of power at all levels. The 12 September meeting was supposed to be the beginning of such negotiations and of regular consultations between the FNPR and the Russian Government. Agreement was reached on developing agreements between the RSFSR Government and the FNPR on social guarantees in connection with the transition to the market. A model agreement was discussed at the FNPR Council and sent to the primary organizations and sector and regional trade union organizations for study. Today it has been submitted for examination by the congress.

During the period of transition to a market, the FNPR considers it necessary to implement as quickly as possible the following tasks, which have a direct relation to living conditions and the social protections of all of Russia's workers.

First: We expect the government to develop a state program to create new jobs and ensure employment and material and social guarantees for the unemployed.

Second: The market must not lead to an increase in the exploitation of labor, such as by maintaining a long work week. The FNPR considers it necessary to achieve a consistent reduction of the work week to 40 hours and, eventually, to 38 hours.

Third: Our trade union associations are in favor of the introduction of a changing wage and pension, which corresponds to the work input of each worker and which compensates for the growth of inflation and consumer prices.

Fourth: The independent trade unions insist on an immediate increase in the guaranteed minimum length of annual vacations, at least to three weeks with an eventual increase to four weeks, and the adoption of an appropriate Russian law.

Fifth: Under conditions of severe shortages of goods, we consider it socially important to immediately saturate the consumer market, at least, with the most critical goods and to end their periodic disappearance from the shelves of stores. And to take more energetic and effective measures to uphold the law and intensify the fight against crime.

An important trend in the activities of the federation of independent trade unions will henceforth be the question of the protection of labor and the ecology.

Saddening statistics testify to the fact that 8,500 people are killed in industrial accidents every year in the RSFSR; 12,500 become invalids; more than 440,000 people are injured; and more than 6,000 workers contract work-related diseases.

We need to change fundamentally our whole system of relations on issues of protecting labor. We need most of all to devise a special law to regulate the rights and obligations of each participant in the production process in the matter of providing for safety in the workplace.

In recent years, problems of the environment have appeared with increasing urgency in our life. There are 43 major Russian cities located in an ecological disaster zone where contamination of the air and water resources is many times greater than permissible norms.

The trade unions consider the problem of ecological security one of the most important in society, since an ecological problem primarily affects laborers and workers of the rayons and settlements. Therefore the FNPR will, first of all, press for the creation of a state system to clean up and monitor the environment, regularly inform the population, and carry out the ecological programs that have been announced.

Secondly, the FNPR Council and its commissions propose to begin conducting independent ecological examinations using assets of the trade unions and to organize civil actions directed at cleaning up technologies and productions that contaminate and pollute nature. FNPR organizations could in this instance make specific proposals to the center and the local powers to overcome the ecological crisis.

We look to the legitimate republic authorities to carry out the proposals and demands that the FNPR sent to the government for the creation of a state program to clean up the effects of the Chernobyl disaster.

The problem of the ecology has another important aspect. I am speaking about the development of alarming tendencies fraught with serious consequences in the future—the curtailment under pressure from various movements of construction of energy facilities and chemistry and microbiology enterprises.

We are in favor of ecological security and the preservation and restoration of the environment. But a thoughtful, reasoned approach is needed in any business. Emotions should never replace hard calculation. We need to find a way out using clean technologies, strict execution of a law on responsibility for polluting the environment, honesty, and openness in information.

At the first meeting of our congress there was unanimous acknowledgement that the renewal of Russia must begin with a renewal of the village. The FNPR will try to achieve economically fair prices for peasant output, the opportunity for free choice of forms of property ownership and conditions for managing the land, freedom of economic activity, and development of a social infrastructure for the countryside.

As a result of a deformed economic policy from the center with regard to the peasantry, the indigenous Russian oblasts, that historic stronghold of Russian statehood, language, and culture, are depopulated in the full sense of the word, do not have proper roads, and have sunken into poverty and an abomination of desolation.

The FNPR Council will speak in favor of devising a state program to create new jobs in that zone on the basis of a well-considered system for settling people using a combination of budgetary financing of construction of roads and highways and provision of gas, electricity, and communication lines in conjunction with attracting investments of concerns, firms, and enterprises, both domestic and foreign, on the basis of the establishment of tax deductions, banking credits, etc.

Our congress cannot and does not have the right to avoid the problem of the renewal of Russian spirituality. The moral foundations of our life are severely undermined, and that gives rise to great alarm. The constituent congress of the Russian trade union of cultural workers took place a few days ago. From the tribunal it was declared that the whole sector is not only in a state of decline, but of genuine devastation and complete destruction. It will not withstand the upcoming "market" blow. The new tax legislation has already undermined the normal activities of cultural and sporting institutions and, if things continue the same way, the process will become irreversible.

Let there be heavy taxes on the incomes of those who organize grand galas, concerts, and speeches by traveling and local stars before thousands of people in stadiums. But taxing village clubs, museums, libraries, sporting clubs, swimming pools, local drama theaters, and the speeches of people's ensembles is immoral. When leaving only crumbs for culture in the first place, the state has no moral right to rob that sector through taxes.

Our congress must speak up in defense of the socioeconomic interests of those categories of workers whose whole lives have been spent serving spirituality and nurturing high morality and a healthy way of life. The teacher, doctor, movie director, librarian, museum director, kindergarten teacher, lighting man in a film studio, stage worker, television producer, and typesetter—there are hundreds of thousands of these people, for whom we must show genuine care.

We also speak in defense of the rights of the intellectual community in the RSFSR and oppose any discrimination against the Russian intelligentsia; we oppose the humiliatingly low wages and traditional limitation of the intelligentsia's right to genuinely free, creative labor.

We can achieve everything our congress favors and everything the FNPR is fighting for only if we have rights that are clearly stipulated by law.

The congress intends to examine a draft law on legal guarantees of trade union activities in the RSFSR and introduce it for the examination of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, as well as a draft declaration on the rights of workers; this will be the contribution of the trade unions to the development of a new RSFSR constitution.

* * *

Six months ago the constituent congress decided to interrupt its meeting for an in-depth reworking of the announced Basic Principles of the organizational structure and activities of the FNPR in trade union organizations and, primarily, for the voluntary and deliberate formation of a Russian trade union association on a fundamentally new basis.

How does the FNPR look today? Today our trade union center unites 94 member organizations, including 75 regional organizations and 19 sectoral organizations. They are made up of more than 328,000 primary organizations and 946 oblast committees and kray committees of trade unions and of councils of representatives of trade union committees, uniting about 54 million members of trade unions or 70 percent of the total trade union members in the RSFSR.

Reform of the Russian trade union movement will be successful only in the event that we succeed in transforming the basic link of the trade unions—the primary organization—in the spirit of the times. This is where the person works, collides with the real problems of life, looks for support and protection, and, finally, pays his dues.

The trade union committee must demonstrate flexibility and the ability in each specific instance to catch at and formulate those problems that concern people and in fact become their advocate and protector. And above the trade union committee and its primary organization are structures that are created by the primary organization, which have received a portion of their rights from it and which answer to it. This is one of the basic, fundamental principles of the FNPR structure.

The appearance in the arena of public life of various organizations speaking in defense of not only the socioeconomic but also the political demands of the worker has become the reality of the day. In the interests of the worker, we are surmounting the barriers of distrust, misunderstanding, and even confrontation between trade union structures that are renewing themselves and a worker's movement that is gaining force.... Thanks to our unity of actions in defense of the interests of the working man, we are prepared to offer a place in the staff of the leadership of the organs of the FNPR to those leaders who have already undergone their baptism of fire and enjoy trust in the workers' associations.

In March of this year, our constituent congress will construct its own relations with all parties on the basis of equality and partnership. I especially need to mention relations with the CPSU. It is the right of each person to belong to one party or another and to have political convictions of one sort or another. Lately, however, under the conditions of the multiparty system arising in the republic, people are asking more and more insistently whether it would be advisable for leaders of the trade union committees and other trade union structures to refrain from participation in elected organs of the CPSU, as well as those of other parties.

As I already noted, the fundamental principle of the actions of the republic's trade union center is to fulfill the orders of its member organizations in accordance with the demands of the workers at the local level.

A unified information system existing from the primary organizations to the republic's trade union center is absolutely necessary to consolidate and unite the trade union movement. Despite the tremendous difficulties with paper and typesetting materials, with the help of enthusiasts we have succeeded in organizing a newspaper and forming an editorial and publishing staff. And today you have the opportunity to hold in your hands the trial issue of the FNPR newspaper PROLOG. Beginning in 1991 it will be published weekly with an initial circulation of 500,000 copies. We consider it fundamentally important that PROLOG not be an organ of the FNPR Council, but rather a newspaper of the FNPR. This should, in our opinion, ensure independence of judgment and difference of opinion on its pages.

* * *

Implementation of a protective policy by the trade unions and an active struggle for the rights of workers in the sphere of wages and working conditions or, in other words, for the entire body of social guarantees—all of this effort, of course, demands material expenditures on the part of the trade unions and the creation of our own credit and financial resources, which would give us great freedom in the choice of form and means of the struggle.

The question that has traditionally agitated trade union officials for many years is: Who should control the budget—the Union trade union central committee, or the trade union councils? In the FNPR, this question does not exist. The budget is controlled by the primary organization, where trade union dues are paid and where each member of the trade union should know what goals they on which they are being spent. Keeping the necessary portion of the funds for its own needs, the primary organization decides what portion should be handed over for creation of sufficiently large funds at other levels and at other echelons of the trade union structure.

The question of trade union property has become especially urgent today. I am speaking about the network of sanitarium, resort, and tourist institutes, sporting structures, health and training centers, and various enterprises and organizations. The fate of this property (and the basic stocks exceed R5 billion), the procedure for possessing it, and its use in the interests of Russian trade unions is troubling the trade union aktiv and the primary organizations. All these question should be resolved without procrastination with regard for demands from the local level.

* * *

At present the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] remains an almost classic, untouched example of a command-administrative structure from the period of stagnation. In its content and working methods, it has completely lost touch with reality and, as the strike actions of 1989-1990 showed, it has lost the opportunity and ability to lead the working movement and, consequently, to exercise authority over the people. Its further existence in such a form is unacceptable to anyone. Under conditions of political reconstruction of the USSR and affirmation of the complete sovereignty of the union republics, and consequently sovereignty of their political and social institutes, a future AUCCTU trade union center is only possible as a coordinating organ of the trade union movement. The former methods of commanding whomever—republic trade union centers or their sector trade unions—must be abandoned. A new AUCCTU center should receive authority from the republics to represent and defend with them—decisively, consistently, and firmly—the interests of the country's trade union movement before the central Union government and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The proposals of the FNPR Council concerning consultations with delegates of the congress amount to formation, on a representative basis, of a small coordinating council of a general confederation of USSR trade unions, representing all the trade unions of the Union republics, including autonomies, as well as federations of sector trade unions. Each member organization has one vote in the adoption of rulings. All questions concerning the confederation are decided by a coordinating council; and an executive committee, made up of the chairman of the general confederation of trade unions, two of his deputies, and the chairmen of the standing commissions, is formed in order to lead the apparat and to conduct organizational efforts. The presidium and secretariat that are characteristic of the AUCCTU are excluded in this manner.

At the congress we must also define our own attitude toward bilateral ties between the FNPR Council and the trade unions of other union republics. I expect that they will be constructed upon an equal, voluntary basis through the conclusion of mutually profitable agreements on cooperation.

...We stand at the threshold of the realization of a block of reforms that will basically form our whole way of life. It will be a difficult stage—a period of difficult experiences that all of society will have to pass through, uprooting decades of dogma and stereotypes and finally moving down the path of world progress, having focused on all the efforts of the individual, his material and spiritual demands, and his daily needs.

RSFSR Unions Seeks Data on Market Programs

904D0237A Moscow TRUD in Russian 23 Sep 90 p 1

[Unattributed article under the rubric "The Trade Unions: Their Position in Perestroyka": "To Defend the Working Man"]

[Text] **As we already reported, the recent Constituent Congress of Russian trade unions adopted a number of documents directed at consolidating forces for a reliable defense of the social interests of workers under conditions of the transition to a market. Today we publish a declaration adopted at the congress entitled "On the Position of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia [FNPR] in Connection With the Program of Transition to a Market."**

The declaration says that the main thing alarming people today is how the socioeconomic consequences of the transition of the economy to market relations will affect them.

Taking this into consideration, in May 1990 the FNPR Council Presidium proposed to conduct a broad public "roundtable" discussion between representatives of the authorities and all levels of trade unions concerning the program of transition to a market economy, the mechanism for carrying it out, and the package of all draft laws. The USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Government ignored this proposal. In the meantime, the situation in the economy and social sphere continues to get worse. The national economy is in a deep crisis, the slump in production continues, and existing economic ties are being broken. Shortages on the consumer market are growing, an unexplained increase in prices is underway, and the standard of living of people is falling. The concept of economic reform adopted by the USSR Second Congress of People's Deputies has not demonstrated its value. Social tensions have reached an extreme, and the patience of the workers is coming to an end.

The declaration states that delegates to the congress are expressing serious alarm at the hasty adoption of rulings concerning the transition to a market without an explanation of their provisions in the labor collectives and to the broad masses of people. People do not know what the transition to the market will bring them, what kind of difficulties await them on the way, and whether there are mechanisms for social protections under conditions of a market economy. As a result, we demand that the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Government and the FNPR Council organize meetings between the authors of the program, members of the government, and the workers, as well as appear in the mass media to explain the planned measures for a transition to a market and the system of social guarantees for the working man.

The congress calls upon trade union organizations to interact constructively and on the basis of principle with the organs of legislative and executive power, paying attention to every attempt to infringe upon the legal rights and interests of the working man.

Metallurgists Appeal Over Switch to Market

*PM2609154790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2*

["Appeal to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev" signed by directors of 55 metallurgical industry plants: "Metallurgists Sound the Alarm"]

[Excerpt] While we regard the transition to a market economy as the only direction for our national economy's further development, we feel alarm that the distinctive features of the operation and development of our base sector are not being taken into account in the choice of options for implementing the economic reform.

The metallurgical industry for decades developed as an integrated industrial complex on the basis of the centralized management of production, material and technical supply, construction, and finances. The technical interdependence of many enterprises and territorial metallurgical complexes demands transfers of raw materials and semifinished items among enterprises which are precisely metered in terms of volume, makeup, and timing. It is necessary to maintain the production links developed as a result of the specialization of metallurgical enterprises, whereby individual kinds of metal products undergo dozens of processes at different enterprises. Sectorial machine building and the repair, scientific research, and planning organizations located in different regions of the country are geared to meet the common requirements of all the enterprises. These factors cannot be ignored. The centralized coordination of the sector's development remains an objective necessity. However, the projected transformations of the economy do not envisage such coordination.

The new wholesale prices for products whose introduction is planned for the start of 1991 will not serve as an effective regulator of market relations, since they possess all the shortcomings of the current system of price formation. These prices, calculated on the basis of the average sectorial manufacturing costs for metal products, condemn enterprises working in unfavorable mining, geological, environmental, climatic, and structural technological conditions to poor economic efficiency. On entering the market economy these enterprises will be unable to provide the financial resources for their production activity, with all the ensuing consequences. On the other hand, the introduction as of 1991 of a uniform tax on profit will sharply differentiate enterprises in terms of income. In contrast to the aforementioned enterprises, the income of enterprises working in favorable conditions will show a substantial increase.

As a consequence of the fact that all the mechanisms for redistributing financial resources within the sector are being abolished from 1991, the problem of preserving enterprises which are of low economic efficiency but absolutely essential for the normal development of the metallurgical industry becomes virtually impossible to solve. More than 100 sector enterprises will need subsidies to maintain their basic activity and more than 200 enterprises will need subsidies to finance the minimum capital investment they require.

The proposals to adopt a tough course of bankruptcy for economically inefficient enterprises, irrespective of their operating conditions, seem to us to be invalid. Economic proportions should be optimized, in our opinion, by regulating the speed of development of individual parts of the national economy rather than by destroying, as a result of the bankruptcy of enterprises, the previously created production potential. It would be a mistake therefore to expect a new organizational structure for the sector to rapidly form solely under the influence of developing market relations without substantial losses to the national economy.

World experience shows that the systematic coordination of the metallurgical industry's development on the part of the state, which has an interest in ensuring the country's independence in terms of resources, promotes its successful functioning. A joint-stock form of management is the most effective way to combine the interests of the producers of metal products, the state, and the sector.

The sector has drawn up proposals for the transformation of enterprises and organizations into joint-stock companies and the formation of voluntary associations of these companies on a joint-stock basis. In contrast to the existing statute on joint-stock companies, where the state is assigned the passive role of owning the unplaced tranche of shares, the metallurgists propose that during the period of transition to a market economy the state retain at least half the shares and that representatives of local soviets be included among the founders of joint-stock companies.

The sector's relations with republics and territories will develop not via the splitting of production complexes but via participation in the income derived from their efficient utilization. Opportunities open up for the flexible restructuring of existing organizational structures and the creation of new ones through the use of the mechanisms of joint-stock relations. The implementation of these proposals will replace the relations of departmental subordination in the sector with ownership relations consonant with the market economy and will make it possible to coordinate by economic methods the work of enterprises toward providing the national economy with essential metal products.

We consider that the transition of the metallurgical industry to joint-stock relations should be carried out as a one-time operation, as a centrally coordinated switching of the sector to a market economy, and here the state, as the owner of the property assigned to enterprises and organizations, should set the conditions for the transition. The delay in practical steps to preserve the unity of the sector is already perceptibly disorganizing production links and financial relations.

To avoid the development of these processes we ask for your assistance in transforming the sector into a system of joint-stock companies in line with the proposed scenario and in switching from rigidly fixed prices for metal products to free prices regulated by the level of product profitability.

Our appeal to you is dictated not by narrow sectorial interests but by a concern to maintain the efficiency of the metallurgical industry—the foundation of our country's economic might. [passage omitted]

Only 'Registered' Locals Can Buy Food in Saratov

PM0210093790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 Sep 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent A. Vorotnikov: "Food Products on Presentation of Passports"]

[Text] Saratov—The oblast soviet of people's deputies presidium has adopted the following decision with a view to normalizing the situation on the Saratov consumer market and stopping some foodstuffs' being taken out of the oblast: As an interim measure, as of 1 October all trading enterprises in Saratov Oblast can only sell meat products, animal and vegetable oil, confectionery, pasta products, groats, cheese, tea, and tobacco products to permanent or temporarily registered residents and servicemen on presentation of a passport or equivalent form of identification.

Economic Woes, Rising Crime Noted in Penza

PM0210133190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 27 Sep 90

[Report by V. Stefanov, S. Inyushkin, V. Meboniya; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Reporter] Life in Penza, until quite recently a happy and tranquil city, has become difficult. Sometimes even the most essential goods are unobtainable. Waiting in lines, irritable people, tired faces, and dissatisfaction have become commonplace. Clearly, the confusion in the country's economy is capable of rocking even such cities as Penza, known for their stability in the past. [video shows street and market scenes]

Prices on the market are creeping up, speculation is spreading, and the crime rate is rising. That is the situation today. And what will happen tomorrow? [passage omitted]

Parts Shortage Said To Endanger Rail Safety

904H0306A Moscow GUDOK in Russian
20 Sep 90 p 3

[Article by GUDOK correspondent B. Sverdlov: "'Safety' Without Foreign Currency"]

[Text] **"Do you remember how Chekhov's 'malefactor' got lucky? He used nuts instead of a sinker on his fishing rod, just like that. In 10 years or so, such malefactors will disappear, and not at all because fishermen will become conscientious, but because nuts on rails will be as rare as hen's teeth." This is how the workers of the Druzhkovka Hardware Plant joke gloomily.**

On the day of my arrival in Druzhkovka, a ruckus broke out. A telegram sent by the Ministry of Railways the day before positively banned supplying rolling stock to the access lines of the hardware plant until it begins shipping bolts and nuts to the railways. For their part, the management of the enterprise also delivered an ultimatum: The Ministry of Railways will not see any rail fasteners until the management sees consumer goods containers at loading facilities. It appeared that a threatening struggle was about to begin.

At the office of the plant, they warned me: "Do not pay attention. Worse words than that have been exchanged. We scare each other as if we were children, and later we come to our senses and begin to make good the arrears. It is good that for now we are in a position to do it, but what are we going to do tomorrow? We feel like sending out an SOS."

I sensed bewilderment in my conversation with the managers of the enterprise. Like the workers, they do not see good prospects.

Plant Director G. Shumkov complained: "We have fallen victim to the arbitrary approach of the late State Committee for Material and Technical Supply [Gosnabb]. About 10 years ago, the bulk of our output was delivered to the railways. Later, the Gossnab required that we sign contracts with other industries. What were we to do—we had to click our heels. At present, we give only one-half to the Ministry of Railways, and we are not entitled to cancel contracts with other users. If we display independent initiative, the State Board of Arbitration [Gosarbitrazh] will hit us with such fines that we will not see the light of day. Of course, it is better for us to deal with a single customer...."

It is easy to understand Gennadiy Ilich. At present, his enterprise is going through a crisis. With every passing day, woes surround them on all sides.

Equipment worth 32 million foreign currency rubles, which was purchased in the FRG 15 years ago and was designed for five, at the most seven years of operation, is becoming absolutely worthless. For 10 years now, spare parts have not been delivered from abroad. Our plants are not in a position to manufacture them.

For more than three years now, our domestic equipment for making similar nuts and bolts, which was developed by our domestic designers and manufactured by the machine builders of Mariupol, has been lifeless: They have not succeeded in starting it up. The R1.5 million the Druzhkovka plant spent for it are a total loss. To be sure, the jacks-of-all-trades at the enterprise still have hopes and are trying to resuscitate the slipshod machine tools.

The current chaos in the economy also affects the plant. All enterprises on which the manufacturing of production by the Druzhkovka collective depends interpreted independence in a peculiar manner. Recently, a request for 70 tonnes of embedded bolts came from the West Siberian Metallurgical Combine. Naturally, the answer was negative: We are having difficulties patching up our own holes. Punishment came swiftly: Rolled metal is going to become an impossible dream for you. And, as they say, obligations to the hardware plant, or more precisely, the state order, fell through.

The situation was exacerbated by the fact that the main supplier, the Krivoy Rog Metallurgical Combine, has been shipping metal to Druzhkovka in a single batch rather than shipping the monthly allocation evenly, as the contract calls for. No amount of rush unloading jobs will help, given the decrepit pool of cranes, and the technological continuity of the enterprise is disrupted.

Recently, one more trouble descended on the plant. Suppliers from Zaporozhye failed to deliver 7,000 screw taps for cutting grooves. This was almost one-half of the required quantity. They had to call in arbitration. This did not help. Due to a shortage of raw materials, the supplier flatly refused to fill the state order. The plant supply procurers rushed immediately to various corners of the country.

The incredible growth of prices also undermined the economics of the plant. The cost of metal increased by 70 percent on the average, whereas hardware output increased by merely 30 percent. The remuneration fund started bursting at the seams when the wages of workers were increased.

Old equipment (the plant still has prerevolution machinery, among other things) requires an incredible physical effort. Naturally, the people do not like this, and workers quit. The adopted Law on the Sovereignty of the Ukraine brought more trouble. An instruction came from Kiev to ship products primarily for the needs of the republic.

Given all of this, many people at the plant became really bewildered: After all, the further it goes, the worse it gets here.

Is there a way out of the existing situation? Could it be that we will actually envy Chekhov's characters who did not consider nuts to be a commodity in short supply? In Druzhkovka, they view an urgent purchase of imported equipment as their own welfare and that of the railway employees. Companies from the FRG have repeatedly offered to sell it. To be sure, it has become four times as expensive by now; its approximate cost comes to 130 million foreign-currency rubles. However, who is to get them this money?

The managers of the enterprise smiled ironically: You say that the Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy should? We have repeatedly asked for, and even demanded funds. Invariably, we have come away empty handed. They have told us that they do not have time for us; their metallurgical combines are falling apart.

Our ministry treats us as stepchildren. For many years now, we have been pleading with the Ministry of Railways to purchase equipment for us. After all, we are not the ones who need rail fasteners; we will return the outlays, and then some.

I rose to the defense of my own sector: "Pardon me, but by the same token the Ministry of Railways may ask your ministry to assist with funds for acquiring imported equipment, for example, for car depots. After all, it is the metallurgical industry that needs the rolling stock."

"This is approximately how they respond to us. However, this debate will not make fastening rails any more secure."

This is true indeed. I recall that at the Konstantinovka track section one of the best track foremen suddenly filed a request to quit. His justification for taking this step was simple:

"I have no desire to end up behind bars because of the shortage of nuts and bolts. If a passenger train derails they will not go easy on me. My children will be left without a father."

I went with him to his line section. What I saw put me out of countenance! Meanwhile, the supply of rail fasteners to the Donetsk Railroad is quite tolerable; the people from the Druzhkovka Plant try not to wrong their compatriots. It is hard to imagine what the situation is on the tracks of, for example, the Trans-Baykal area. After all, the arrears of the plant for this year are such that two long trains would be required to carry them.

At the October Main Line, they could no longer cope with the acute shortage, and dispatched their own representative to negotiate with Druzhkovka. The guest offered to buy an imported machine tool with the funds of his railroad, provided that 40 percent of the conveyer output will be shipped to meet the needs of the October Railroad. At the plant, they jumped at the offer.

G. Shumkov asked: "Please, do not report this visit in GUDOK; the Ministry of Railways may inadvertently do in the initiative."

It appears that at present the railways are short of everything. What can they do? They must resign themselves to certain things, but not a need for rail fasteners. One may talk ad infinitum about the safety of train traffic during teleconferences, but it will not be improved in the absence of nuts and bolts. We should not be stingy by any means in this most important endeavor. After all, nothing comes dearer than human lives.

An-28 To Be Converted for Civilian Use

LD2809063690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 28 Sep 90

[Text] The Novosibirsk Chkalov Aviation Academy has decided, within the framework of conversion, to tackle what for it is a new product—a civilian aircraft. This will be a modification of the An-28 aircraft intended for use in local airlines.

Deal Readied for Purchase of Printer's Supplies

PM2509111790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Sep 90 p 1

[Report by St. Kucher: "Enough Money. And Newspapers Too"]

[Text] "A money shortage is imminent," KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA wrote under the headline "Marx' Dream Comes True—Money Abolished." If you recall, we were discussing the problems over printer's ink. But it had seemed that we still had some way to go to communism when were helped out by—who do you think?—N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. It was confirmed the other day that a problem that has not been resolved for months could be solved in the space of a few days. And the decision was made for the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity to allocate 3.2 million foreign currency rubles for the purchase abroad of the components needed for the production of printer's ink.

We have been informed by the USSR State Committee for the Press that the purchase order is now going ahead at full speed. Letters of credit have already been drawn up and only remain to be signed. The West German firm "Besherst" will start delivering the necessary pigments in the very near future.

Political Interference Alleged in Newsprint Output

PM2709134490 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 38, 30 Sep-7 Oct 90 p 3

[Article by Varvara Polezhayeva, deputy director of economic affairs, Solikamsk pulp and paper mill: "Paper Industry Choked by Red Tape"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted]

Our commodity—newsprint—is considered a strategic resource (its production has always been controlled by the CPSU Central Committee's Ideological Department). If so, the state should assume responsibility for the health of the sector.

But the policy of the state is to issue a state order, but not provide the raw materials. The state should pay us for its failure to honour its commitments. In actual fact, we are fined for not fulfilling contracts through someone else's fault.

An absurdity from the standpoint of normal business practice. But the whole point is that even elementary laws of business do not work in a state-run economy. The state as a partner is omnipotent and irresponsible. And if this is also going to be the case in market conditions, the state sector, already a mess, will simply not survive.

But, after all, nothing has been changed so far. Recently Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers Belousov in charge of the military-industrial complex used his authority to give the timber which used to come to our mill to an enterprise which needs paper solely for its internal needs. I rushed to Moscow to find out why from Gusev, the deputy premier who is in charge of us. He explained that in the Council of Ministers there is a rule to observe ethics and under no circumstances to cancel the instructions of one another.

But maybe the point is not in ethics. Maybe the state-owner hopes that material losses in the production of paper will be compensated for by ideological gain. After all, the case with Belousov is just one of many state actions which are ruining our industry. The graver the situation with paper, the less chance glasnost has of surviving. Perhaps this is the intent behind the interference. [passage omitted]

Agricultural

Harvesting Emergency Declared in Krasnodar

LD0210110490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 2 Oct 90

[Text] A report from Krasnodar: Because of the extremely slow pace of harvesting, a state of emergency has been declared today in the kray territory. Presidia and executive committees of soviets of people's deputies in Kuban have been granted the right to dismiss from their jobs those workers who fail to carry out their decisions and instructions for salvaging the harvest. The package of emergency measures envisages completing harvesting in the shortest timespan and laying-in food supplies for the winter.

Emergency Measures for Harvest in Vitebsk

LD0210081390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 2 Oct 90

[Summary] Emergency measures have been taken in Vitebsk Oblast to save the harvest. Fifty thousand hectares of grain crops and half of the potatoes and flax are still in the fields. Peasants and town-dwellers are to be allowed to cut and thresh grain for themselves.

Emergency Declared in Bryansk Oblast Harvest

LD0110221390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1900 GMT on 1 October broadcasts a 1-minute announcer-read report that a state of emergency in harvesting has been introduced in Bryansk oblast today by decision of the Presidium of the oblast Soviet of People's Deputies. An oblast extraordinary commission has been set up, as well as similar commissions in all rayons.

Moscow Soviet Urges Citizens To Pick Potatoes

LD1110224990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Text] The presidium of the Moscow Soviet has called upon all labor collectives and citizens of the capital to take part on the coming Saturdays and Sundays in the harvest of potatoes and vegetables in the Moscow oblast.

All deputies of Moscow Soviet and of rayon soviets, all staff of the Moscow Soviet and of the Moscow City Executive Committee, rayon soviets, and rayon executive committees are also invited.

In connection with the participation of Muscovites in the harvst, the presidium considers it inexpedient to hold rallies and demonstrations in Moscow on these days, and the last of them falls on Constitution Day.

Moscow Officials Explain Potato Shortage

LD0110122590 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Zenkovich]

[Text] Moscow October 1 TASS—Belorussian Deputy Prime Minister Fedor Synko said that insufficient deliveries of potatoes to Moscow were due to a generally small crop yield in the republic, harvesting difficulties and transport shortages. Chairman of the Moscow City Council Gavriil Popov believes the shortage is explained by the "potato policy" pursued by local communist organisations.

Addressing a press conference, arranged here on Friday by the interregional deputy group, Popov, who is one of the group's leaders, said that not only the husbandries around Moscow were at fault. They are responsible for no more than 40 per cent of the total quantity of vegetables required by the city. The remaining amount comes from Belorussia and the Ryazan region.

Synko, who heads the Belorussian State Committee for Agriculture and Food Production, told TASS, that the republic is to supply Moscow with 120,000 tonnes of potatoes in the autumn and 30,000 tonnes in the spring. 40,000 Tonnes have already been delivered to the capital.

Senko said that potato yields have dropped catastrophically in the republic this year due to the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster and endless rains, which have turned Belorussian fields into swamps. Harvesting machinery cannot be used, and the potato crop is perishing from moisture and fungus diseases. Only 53 per cent of the potatoes have been harvested, despite the efforts of the 125,000 students and schoolchildren who are now working on the fields. Last year 79 per cent of the crop was harvested.

Ten per cent of the potato crop area could not be cultivated because of radioactive contamination. Pesticides were prohibited, because scientists have proved their particular harmfulness in conditions of heightened radiation. "And there will also be difficulties after the potato crop is harvested. Moist potatoes begin to rot quickly in storehouses," Synko noted.

Synko expressed concern about Moscow's failure to provide the necessary motor transport. Belorussia asked for 600 trucks to deliver vegetables to the capital but received only 89.

The weather has improved in the republic recently. "If there is no rain in the next few days," Synko said, "all 120,000 tonnes of potatoes will be sent to Moscow by October 10."

"In general," he noted, "Moscow leaders have never been reliable partners, but their work is particularly poor this year. There is absolutely no way to contact the Moscow leadership."

But there are also other views on this score. Head of the Moscow City Agroindustrial Committee Aleksandr Rudakov said that there were no Moscow representatives only in Belorussia's Gomel region, which, he said, bluntly refused to share its potato crop with Moscow. Referring to the shortage of motor transport, he said Moscow has sent 215 trucks to Belorussia.

Council of Ministers Increases Meat Prices

PM0210112390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "In USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers has adopted an ordinance on the early introduction, as of 1 October this year, of new state purchase prices for large horned cattle, pigs, sheep, and poultry, approved by the USSR Council of Ministers 9 August 1990 resolution No. 792. These prices include the differentiated increments in operation and increments for the sale of livestock and poultry to the state over and above the average level achieved in the 11th five-year plan and provide for compensation for increased costs in connection with the establishment as of 1 January 1991 of new wholesale prices and rates for industrial output and services and new rates for social security and other payments.

It has been established that for livestock and poultry sold to the state in January through September 1990 increments for exceeding the average level for the sale of this output reached in the 11th five-year plan are paid on the basis of the results for the nine months and relate to prices which operated before 1 October this year.

Additional expenditure in the fourth quarter of 1990 on the reimbursement of the difference in prices (in connection with the increase in purchase prices) for meat and meat products used for internal republican consumption and obtained through interrepublican deliveries is financed through the funds of the budgets of the relevant union republics and for meat and meat products delivered to Moscow and Leningrad (except for deliveries from the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]) and to special consumers of the all-union stocks through funds from the union budget.

The USSR Council of Ministers has noted that the RSFSR Council of Ministers in its 8 September 1990 resolution No. 343 provided for the finding of the necessary funds to cover additional expenditure in connection with the introduction of new purchase prices for livestock and poultry.

The union republic councils of ministers, by agreement with the USSR State Committee on Prices and the USSR Ministry of Finance, have been instructed as of 1 October 1990 to introduce subsidy rates (wholesale prices) [as published] for meat and meat products proceeding from the new purchase prices for livestock and poultry.

In connection with the adoption of this ordinance agriculture's additional expenditure in the fourth quarter of this year from the introduction of new prices will be over 5 billion rubles. Here the state's payments for one tonne of large horned cattle purchased from collective farms, state farms, other agricultural enterprises and organizations, lessees, and peasant farms will increase 31 percent while the payments for pigs will increase 23 percent, for sheep 16 percent, and for poultry 40 percent.

Feed Procurement Problems Affect Livestock

904B0310B Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 25 Sep 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by M. Aratov: "Reflections on the Report of the State Committee for Statistics: Confrontation on the Feed Field"]

[Text] These two subjects were shown on television almost one right after the other. First we saw a disheartened person in a never-ending field studded with tight heads of cabbage. He threw up his hands in confusion: Under the agreement Moscow had promised to send more than 8,000 people to help with the harvest and only 4,700 are working—and even they are sometimes doing sloppy work. In a day the local school children gather half again as much as "assistants" who have come here do. And this happened near the city of Dmitrov, on the Yakhroma lowland, which is renowned for its fertility, where the capital's main suburb has stretched out from early times. Just a little bit later the television viewers saw the mayor of Moscow, G.Kh. Popov. He, too, threw up his hands: The cupboards are full of agreements but deliveries of meat to the city are being interrupted. And right here he suggested to everyone as one man... no, do not go and help the peasants, but gather at a rally and demand that the government retire since it has not even been able to organize the harvest.

This incident automatically came to mind when I looked at the reports that had just come in to the editorial office from the State Committees for Statistics on the USSR and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] on the course of feed preparation and the condition of animal husbandry. We know how generously we were provided with grass and other feeds this year. But what about their preparation? So far less than 65 million tons of hay have been stored up—in any past year we have had more than 75 million tons. There are about 80,000 tons of straw in the ricks, compared to the previous 85 million, and we have received 125 million tons of prepared silage, while in previous years by this time we have never had less than 200 million. The supplies of grass meal and other artificially dehydrated feeds are lagging behind those of previous years as well. And although we have stored up more silage than in past years—88 million tons—this does not change the overall picture. The sad total: For every conventional head of cattle (this is the most precise generalizing indicator) we have stored up 11.3 quintals of feed units while in any preceding year we have and no less than 14.5 quintals. The farms of Lithuania were closest to this level (12.4 quintals). The smallest quantities of feeds were stored up in Georgia (7.18 quintals of feed units) and Moldavia (7.26). Things were only a little better in Estonia (8.23 quintals of feed units), Armenia (8.42), Tajikistan (8.98), and Turkmenia (9.84 quintals).

The seriousness of the situation is shown by the results of the work of the feed procurement workers of the Russian Federation—the largest of the Union republics. The areas of mown grass, the quantity of prepared coarse feeds, including hay, and the production of grass meal—all these indicators this year are the lowest they have been in the past five years. Never before in the five-year plan that is now coming to an end has Russia entered the winter with such meager forage supplies. And what does this mean? Some leaders see this as the work of the-...Center.

In certain regions the farms are simply close to collapse. In the Volgo-Vyatka Region, things are worst on the farms of Mordovia, where they have only stored up 8.8 quintals of feed units per conventional head. They have prepared one-third less hay here than they did last year; straw—almost 60 percent less, silage—a little more than one-fourth less, and all coarse and juicy feeds—52 percent less. The situation was no better on the farms of Voronezh Oblast (8.0 quintals of feed units per conventional head), Tambov (7.6), Astrakhan (8.3), Irkutsk (7.6), Chita (6.2), Khabarovsk Kray (7.6), and the autonomous republics: Kalmyk (8.5), Buryat (5.5), and Tuva (2.1 quintals of feed units). They will not make it until spring with these forage supplies.

In such a situation the most resolute measures, the most energetic actions, and general cooperative work are needed. Because today's forage supplies determine tomorrow's productivity on the farms. And if nothing is corrected, to the shortage of medicines and energy caused by the ill-considered actions of the "Greens" who have managed to get enterprises and hydroelectric power plants closed, and to the empty shelves for industrial goods, we can add a meat and dairy famine. And that is more terrible than a lack of tights or tobacco.

The collective and state farms and the interfarm enterprises of the country decreased their production of meat, milk, and eggs in August. And since the beginning of the year the sale of cattle and poultry in slaughtered weight has already decreased by more than 100,000 tons as compared to last year. In all Union republics except the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Turkmenia, the gross milk yields have decreased, and in Moldavia they have stayed at last year's level. The growth of the milk yield from cows, which had been steady up to that point, has practically come to a halt. In the Komi Autonomous Republic in August they obtained 20 kilograms of milk per cow less than in the same month of last year, in Ryazan Oblast—25, and the Mordovian ASSR—30 kilograms less—and this is the worst result in the European part of Russia. There has been a sharp decline in the productivity of the dairy herd on the farms of Penza, Saratov, Sverdlovsk, and Chita oblasts, Maritime Kray, and the Tuva Autonomous Republic. Even Sakhalin, where one of the best herds in the country is concentrated, has had a decline.

Here we no longer have the time to wait until market relations are arranged, economic levers go into effect, and the self- regulating mechanism goes into operation. In any case the path to it is not at hand. We are straightening out the disagreements. But we must straighten them out with a clear head and in a situation of strong pressure, chaos, and confusion. I am writing about this because recently more and more frequently we have been receiving reports about the destabilizing actions of various forces directed—let us call things by their real names—toward undermining this most important seasonal agricultural work. The Ryazan city soviet presidium headed by Deputy V.V. Ryumin, as a TASS correspondent reports, interprets aid from the city dwellers to the rural areas as a factor that is destabilizing the situation in the city. In Kostroma Oblast the People's Front tried to discredit the appeal to the city dwellers to go out and help in the preparation of feeds and the harvesting of the crops. The most difficult situation developed in Mordovia. In a number of rayons feed preparations were almost halted, and things were bad with the harvesting of food crops. The 10-month plan for the procurement of cattle and poultry was fulfilled by only 78 percent, and milk—by 90 percent. But as soon as the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium began to take measures to save the crops—in particular, it spoke out against conducting various conferences and seminars during this busy time and postponed the date for convening the session of the Supreme Soviet until 2 October—accusations were heard from the people's deputies: They are taking advantage of the occasion to try to suppress democracy.

What a contrast there is between these actions and the position of the party organizations! In the Dagestan ASSR, where they have stored up only 8.3 quintals of feed units per conventional head, communists considered themselves mobilized for the preparation of feeds. Workers of many rayon party committees [raykoms] went out to the fields and meadows, and signs appeared on their doors: "The raykom is closed. Everyone has gone to the fields." In Moscow, relying on the labor collectives, the city party committee gathered party workers and communists who are leaders of enterprises in order to develop mass agitation work and bring 80,000 people out into the fields. But the "city fathers" declared 21-23 September a holiday for all of Moscow—Day of the City.

There is no doubt that nature has now aggravated the situation in the feed fields to the extreme. It is important to counteract this with unity of actions and efficient organization of all work and to think about how to supplement the food on the people's table, and now about how to take advantage of their poverty for political purposes.

Military

'Shchit' Leader Cited on Coup Prospects

PM0110155690 Madrid ABC in Spanish
28 Sep 90 p 35

[Interview with Vitaliy Urashev, deputy chairman of "Shchit" (Shield), by Alberto Sotillo; place and date not given]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Sotillo] Colonel Sergey Kudinov recently claimed that troops concentrated around Moscow are preparing for "an extraordinary event." Do you consider the situation alarming? Is the Army tempted to embark on a political adventure?

[Urashev] Troops have been concentrated not only around Moscow but around all the major urban centers. The situation is very alarming. Communist ideology is crumbling and there is a widespread crisis of authority. The parliaments' measures are being ignored. The laws are not being obeyed, and neither are Gorbachev's ukases. This is a worrying situation because in our country crises end either in bloodshed or in a dictatorship.

[Sotillo] So do you believe that this situation increases the chances of a coup?

[Urashev] We live constantly under the threat of this happening. But in our opinion it will never be done by the Army. Nor will it be plotted by the military or the KGB. The Army would only carry out a coup if it receives an order from the Communist Party.

[Sotillo] But are there any grounds for believing that the hypothesis of a legal coup is any more than mere speculation?

[Urashev] There are. Clandestine members of our organization have informed us that last summer a large-scale troop movement was tried out from Kamchatka in the far east toward the center. This was an experimental coup in which the forces would advance according to how much resistance they encounter and in which the declaration of a state of emergency at the same time would pave the way for them.

[Sotillo] Who are these clandestine members of your organization?

[Urashev] They are soldiers on active service who cannot reveal that they belong to our organization because they would be automatically withdrawn from service. Colonel Kudinov was one of them until it was necessary to reveal him.

[Sotillo] Are these clandestine members your information sources about which Gorbachev expressed such concern?

[Urashev] Yes, though not the only one. Our open members gather political intelligence; we try to gather intelligence within the military-industrial complex; and last, there are also Interior Ministry and KGB officials willing to cooperate with us.

[Sotillo] Do you not believe that the forces billeted in Moscow are just waiting to see if disturbances occur on the anniversary of the revolution?

[Urashev] The situation is very serious in all respects. Our criminal government has already started to sell off our gold reserves and assets in order to feed people, and it would not be surprising if a contingent were to be established in order to crush by force any possible popular rising. The Army is just awaiting orders.

[Sotillo] What influence does parliament have on the Army?

[Urashev] It is only the Communist Party that controls the Army. Deputies are forbidden from entering any military units, and the Army refuses even to give them its data.

[Sotillo] What does the parliamentary military surveillance committee do?

[Urashev] They try to draft bills. Moreover 75 percent of its members are members either of the military or of the military-industrial complex, while the other 25 percent are officials of the Communist Party apparatus.

CPSU Members Desired as Political Officers

90SV0095A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Sep 90 First Edition p 4

[Reply by Major General V. Lashtabega, chief of a department of the directorate of organizational-party work of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy, to a question posed by Senior Lieutenant M. Vereshchagin: "A Political Worker Who Is Not a Member of the CPSU?"]

[Text] Can a political worker in the Army not be a member of the party, or be a member of another party not the CPSU? Why not?

[Signed] Senior Lieutenant M. Vereshchagin

[Lashtabega] As is known, on 3 September of this year the president of the USSR signed a ukase on the reformation of political organs "in connection with changes to the USSR Constitution and policy on the division of state and party functions introduced by the special Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies."

In a three-month period, the USSR Ministry of Defense and the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy, with the participation of appropriate organs, must submit proposals on new military-political organs in the Army and Navy.

In contrast to the political organs they will have a different status, function, and structure. These will be organs for the conduct of state policy in the USSR Armed Forces and the education and social protection of servicemen. Absolutely new subunits will appear in them—psychology and sociology which, on the basis of the analysis of processes occurring in units, will develop and implement specific measures of educational work and the mobilization of personnel for the resolution of tasks that face military collectives.

Will nonparty people be able to work in them? This is not ruled out, especially for such positions as youth officer, cultural and recreational officer, psychologist, and sociologist. But this phenomenon will not be widespread. It is not likely that a political officer will also be a member of a different party. Inasmuch as party committees, for whom work with officers is the main field of activity, will develop in them a need to associate their destiny first and foremost with the CPSU—the political leader and vanguard among other public parties and organizations of a socialist choice. Although the last will be proven by life and practical work in the future development of military-political organs. At the present time, the party layer among officers in the Army and Navy is 75 percent.

CPSU Central Committee Secretary Meets Troops

LD0110181890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Text] The mutual relations between the party and the Armed Forces of the USSR, of the frontier troops of the USSR KGB, the reform of the political bodies, and of course of perestroyka in society—these and other questions were in the center of attention at the meeting between the officers and personnel of a unit of the Red Banner Central Asian frontier district and CPSU Central Committee Secretary Kuptsov.

He was briefed on the conditions of everyday life and leisure of the personnel, the unit's museum of military glory, and the permanent military camp. He met the families of servicemen and answered numerous questions.

'Last' Baltic Nuclear Submarine Decommissioned

LD0110130190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Text] The last Baltic Fleet submarine capable of carrying nuclear weapons has been decommissioned from the USSR Navy. The submarine has been disarmed and the crew disbanded. Thus the promise made by the Soviet leadership on the elimination of carriers of nuclear weapons in the Baltic, given by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Helsinki in the fall of last year, has been carried out.

Contract To Raise Komsomolets Signed

LD0110123590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Summary] The central design bureau of the "Rubin" marine technology complex has signed a contract with Smit Tak B.V, a Dutch consortium, to carry out initial work to lift the nuclear submarine Komsomolets.

According to the foreign press, lifting the submarine will cost $250 million.

Baltic Republics

Coverage of Lithuania-USSR 2 Oct Negotiations

Talks To Start 2 Oct

PM0110194190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by A. Lashkevich: "Lithuania Getting Ready for Talks"]

[Text] Vilnius—As has become known from official sources, a meeting of state delegations of the USSR and Lithuania on talks will be held Tuesday 2 October.

The date for the start of talks was agreed during a telephone conversation between N. Ryzhkov and K. Prunskiene at the end of last week. It seems that the political situation, which was fraught with uncertain ambiguity and gave rise to disputes and disagreements among various political forces, is clearing up little by little. Many people in the republic have begun to breathe more freely in the hope of a rapid resolution of the Lithuanian problem.

Time will tell whether the sides will reach a mutual accord. For the time being all one can definitely say is that Lithuania does not intend in any way to give up the idea of independence and does not intend to take part in the preparation and drafting of a Union treaty. This is the firm position of the official Lithuanian delegation which is led by V. Landsbergis. Other questions—the drafting of young men into the Army; foreign ties; the issuing of visas, borders, economic relations; and many others—have to be given specific form in the actual course of bilateral dialogue. Incidentally, the nature of the meeting between the delegations will be determined later, and therefore the moratorium on the 11 March Act of Independence will certainly not start 2 October.

In recent days the Lithuanian Republic state delegation has started working energetically. Sessions and conferences are being held, an effective exchange of opinions is under way, and the range of questions to be discussed is being refined.

Ryzhkov Confirms Talks

LD0110135490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Text] Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, confirmed that talks with Lithuanian representatives concerning the future status of this baltic republic will take place in Moscow on Tuesday [2 October].

Ryzkhov telephoned Prunskiene, prime minister of Lithuania, in order to solve the differences concerning the composition of the two delegations.

Delegation Meets Before Departure

LD0110110190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] Tomorrow, members of both state delegations—those of Lithuania and the Soviet Union—will meet, probably in the Kremlin. [passage omitted]

The Lithuanian delegation will leave for Moscow today probably at 1900. At least this is what is planned. Meanwhile, the delegation members once again gathered for joint talks.

Landsbergis Leads Delegation

LD0110192490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1800 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Text] The Lithuanian Republic's state delegation, led by Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis, departed for Moscow today, for a first consultation meeting with the Soviet delegation.

Also included in the delegation for inter state negotiations with the Soviet Union are Aleksandras Abisalas, Pranas Kuris, Romualdas Ozolas, Kazimiera Prunskiene, Algirdas Saudargas, Ceslovas Stankevicius, and Emanuelis Zingeris.

Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunsiene held a pre-departure press conference.

Prunskiene Comments Prior to Talks

LD0210011790 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Before leaving for Moscow, Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene gave a news conference tonight. She said, with the optimism that is always characteristic of her, that she was confident that it would be agreed in Moscow to start proper negotiations, according to the protocol tabled by Lithuania. She pointed out, however, that much would depend on what stand the Soviet premier took at the first meeting. In the opinion of Kazimiera Prunskiene, President Gorbachev will most likely also take part in the consultations, although he is not a member of the official Soviet delegation.

News has been released that a group of leading officials of the Lithuanian branch of the Soviet Union's Communist Party has also left for Moscow today. The pro-Union Communists openly speak against Lithuania's independence, so their envoys are likely to seek, one way or another, participation in the bilateral Lithuanian- Soviet consultations or talks. Last week, in his phone call to the Lithuanian prime minister, Soviet Prime Minister Ryzhkov also expressed such an interest. Speaking at the news conference today, Kazimiera Prunskiene reaffirmed the stand of the Lithuanian delegation, that the pro-Moscow communists of Lithuania must not in any way participate in the dialogue between Vilnius and the Kremlin.

Today, the Lithuanian prime minister made an official statement about the attacks launched by certain political groupings against her and her cabinet. Kazimiera Prunskiene defined as absolutely groundless, and intentionally or unintentionally misleading, the allegation that she was trying to get Lithuanian back into the Soviet Union. Identifying the government with the Lithuanian Communist Party, and the latter with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, is either political dilettantism or purposeful undermining of Lithuania's independence and its budding democracy. Lithuania's statehood is still too frail to tolerate, or even incite parliamentary and governmental crisis, without the risk of losing the support and trust of the world, Kazimiera Prunskiene said in her statement.

Lithuanian Spokesman Cited

LD0110154290 Moscow TASS in English 1451 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandras Budrys]

[Text] Moscow October 1 TASS—A Lithuanian delegation, led by President Vytautas Landsbergis, is expected to arrive in Moscow tonight, a spokesman from the Lithuanian permanent mission in Moscow told TASS.

The delegation, formed by the Lithuanian parliament for negotiations with the Soviet Union, is expected to take part in a consultative meeting with the Soviet leadership on Tuesday.

Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov is expected to head the Soviet delegation, which was formed by President Mikhail Gorbachev's decree of July 9, after the Lithuanian parliament said it was ready to declare a moratorium on the act of Lithuanian independence during talks with the Soviet Union.

The meeting cannot be considered the beginning of official talks, because the sides have yet to sign a joint protocol on their conditions, Lithuanian permanent mission press secretary Leonginas Vasiliauskas said. The Lithuanian side has prepared a draft protocol, and it was passed over to the Soviet leadership in the beginning of August.

Ryzhkov suggested holding a meeting speaking to Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazmiera Prunskiene by telephone on Thursday. A week ago, Prunskiene met President Gorbachev in Moscow. After the meeting, she said negotiations might begin in the near future.

Prunskiene told TASS that agreements on specific issues could be reached during negotiations, but "great differences over bilateral relations could emerge".

The Lithuanian side insists that Moscow recognise the republic's independence, proclaimed on March 11, while the Soviet leadership believes Lithuania will benefit if it remains a sovereign state within the framework of the Soviet Union.

Talks Begin 2 Oct

LD0210114990 Moscow TASS in English 1136 GMT 2 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandras Budris]

[Text] Soviet and Lithuanian leaders began a consultative meeting in the Kremlin today as part of preparations for talks regarding future relations between Moscow and Vilnius.

The Soviet delegation, led by Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, was set up under President Mikhail Gorbachev's decree of July 9, after the Lithuanian parliament said it would announce a moratorium on its declaration of independence for the duration of the talks with the USSR.

The Lithuanian delegation, which arrived in Moscow late on Monday [1 October], is led by Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis.

According to Lithuanian spokesman Leonginas Vasiliauskas, "the current meeting cannot be regarded as the beginning of official negotiations because a joint protocol on its conditions has yet to be signed."

The Lithuanian side prepared its draft of the protocol, which was submitted to the Soviet leadership in early August.

The meeting was proposed by Ryzhkov to his Lithuanian counterpart in a phone conversation last Thursday. On Monday last week [24 September], Lithuanian Premier Kazimiera Prunskiene met the Soviet president in Moscow, after which she said bilateral talks could start soon. Prunskiene told TASS that, hopefully, future negotiations will produce agreements on separate issues, but there can arise "large differences in defining bilateral relations".

It is known that the Lithuanian side insists on Moscow recognising the republic's independence, proclaimed on March 11, while the Soviet leadership believes that Lithuania can benefit from remaining a sovereign state within the USSR.

The Lithuanian delegation is expected to hold a news conference later today.

Goal To Set Up 'Negotiations'

LD0210010490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] In his address last weekend to the Lithuanian Journalist Association in Vilnius, Vytautas Landsbergis noted among other things that negotiations for negotiations will start tomorrow, and not negotiations for recognition of independent Lithuania. He reminded them that only from the start of the real negotiations will the already pledged Lithuanian obligation begin to function in Lithuania. That is to say, the 100-day moratorium of the 11 March Act Concerning Restoration of Lithuania's Independence. The moratorium will automatically cease if negotiations break off.

Gorbachev 'Likely' To Participate

LD0210082190 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0723 GMT 2 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—Delegations of the USSR and of the Baltic Republic of Lithuania, which is seeking independence, met for their first talks in the Kremlin, Moscow, this morning. This was reported to ADN in a telephone call by a member of staff of the Lithuanian mission in Moscow.

The delegations are headed by Nikolay Ryzhkov chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and by Vytautas Landsbergis, the head of the Lithuanian parliament. The Lithuanian side thinks it "very likely" that Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev will take part in this first meeting.

According to information available so far, the talks are only consultations and do not represent the beginning of official negotiations between Moscow and Vilnius. Lithuania wants a protocol to be signed before the start of the negotiations which lays down issues, conditions, and objectives of the negotiations.

Prunskiene 'Under Fire' as Economy Founders

LD0110201390 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun]

[Text] Vilnius October 1 TASS—The government of Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene is coming under fire as the republic's economic position continues to deteriorate.

Prunskiene's main defence thus far has been that "the government's activities are aimed at asserting Lithuania's independence."

Explaining her idea in an interview with the EKHO LITVY newspaper, Prunskiene stressed that the government is drafting a "programme for economic reform and reorganisation of the Lithuanian economy and foreign policy."

As for switching to new economic relations, "privatisation will begin after parliament adopts remaining laws," she noted.

Prunskiene pins great hopes on a meeting between representatives of the Baltic republics, Moldavia, Belorussia and the Russian Federation which was held in Tallinn last Friday. Commenting on its results, she emphasised that "this was the snatching of the initiative from the centre and the formation of new relations, including multilateral."

She predicted that east and central European countries may participate in the next Tallinn meeting. "The (?Czech) republic has expressed a desire to participate in such a meeting," she said.

Prunskiene believes the discussion at the meeting of maintaining economic relations at the 1990 level the Lithuanian economy from collapse. [sentence as received]

Lithuanian Party To Hold Extraordinary Congress

LD0210110390 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Excerpt] The Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party decided to call its extraordinary congress at the beginning of December. The congress is to make changes in the program document adopted a year ago and found a virtually new political organization. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian Domestic Political Scene Viewed

PM0110135790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Sep 90 First Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent Captain Second Rank V. Gromak: "Tension and Uncertainty"]

[Text] Cold rain was falling in Vilnius on the evening of 11 September. A few pickets were hiding behind the columns of the parliament building, passers by were hurrying to take shelter in the subways from the wind and rain. Somehow you had absolutely no sense that it was a holiday—half a year of independence—in Lithuania. That is quite unlike the Lithuanians. The republican newspapers also kept a reticent silence about this date. Only GIMTASIS KRASHTAS wrote: "There is no denying these six months have been hard, but not fruitless, not empty. They have not only provided considerable experience but also revealed problems about which we knew before but did not interpret very realistically. World attention toward Lithuania has also slackened over this time."

Yes, that is so. The wave of euphoria has subsided and the legislative process has slowed down. On the other hand instances of the defilement of monuments, the desecration of graves, and vandalism have become more frequent. They are a kind of attempt to divert the people from the urgent issues of the day. Primarily economic issues.

"An increasing number of goods are becoming scarce," I was told a few days ago by an old friend, Vitas Yemelyanovas.

In the stores of the Lithuanian capital it is immediately noticeable that there are tangibly fewer eggs and less poultry and meat on the shelves—shipments of feed grain from other republics have been reduced. And at the same time speculation is flourishing.

Whether you want it or not even the republic's press is being increasingly obliged to write about cases of speculation and theft. And not only in the capital. "Economic chaos," notes VECHERNIYE NOVOSTI, the Lithuanian capital's independent evening newspaper, "which is caused by speculation, has obliged the deputies of the Kaunas self-management to think in earnest. The commission for trade and services has elaborated the 'basic directions of state trade in the city for the immediate future.'"

Yu. Zvinakis, chief of the trade department, read out this document at the session. One recommendation was: "Forbid trade organizations to purchase new imported and Soviet goods from the population and sell them at so-called contract prices."

And here is the opinion of Vilnius inhabitant M. Bayrashevskiy: "They have simply forgotten about us mortals. In this situation, with the frenzied increase in prices, how can one replace worn shoes or frayed pants?"

The various businessmen, economists, and lawyers who in the past zealously unrolled models for the financial and banking system of economic perestroyka have recently declined in number in Lithuania. The West is reacting precisely to the situation. The visits across the ocean by the prime minister and other members of parliament have failed to bring anything substantial. Irreversible processes are also taking place in the Lithuanian countryside. S. Serzhantovich, a tractor driver on the "Pyargale" collective farm, told me that the village is in a tense state. Of course the Lithuanian peasant has since time immemorial been hardworking and conscientious but even his endeavor and enterprise are not helping. Material and technical supplies are at a low level and the unequal exchange of agricultural and industrial output is intensifying. Where will surplus meat and milk be taken from? Yet it is precisely with this surplus that the government plans to buy oil, gas, metal, and coal.

Who is to blame for the situation which has taken shape? This question is being heard increasingly frequently in Lithuania today. The 22-23 September congress of self-management deputies from "Sajudis" did not give an answer to this question. Delivering the report, V. Landsbergis urged his supporters merely to be well aware of the hard situation and to toughen up the struggle against crime and speculation and to be more concerned about heating.

But at the same time one of the founders of "Sajudis," now a coordinator of the liberal union—it was created in late June—said in an interview: "Disillusion reigns in society. People are particularly upset that lawlessness is being perpetrated in politics: Political decisions are being taken while the majority of laws are inoperative. So the prospect is gloomy."

The concluding stage of the 21st congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) answered this question even more precisely. "Lithuania's economic situation is characterized by the increasing manifestation of chaos and destruction. The policy of denationalization which the Lithuanian parliament and government are carrying out is in fact designed to legalize the power of the shadow economy and to eliminate any social guarantees for working people."

Actually, the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet thinks otherwise. On 10 September the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted an official statement sharply criticizing the actions of "conservative forces of the USSR." This statement blames the Soviet Union for the present economic difficulties and the buildup of sociopolitical tension in Lithuania. It is charged with "refusing to guarantee the fulfillment of contract commitments for deliveries of raw material and goods as of 1 October this year," with "diplomatic blockade tactics," "the usurping of Lithuania's borders," "armed intervention in civic affairs," "the persecution of young men who have refused to serve in the Soviet Army," and so forth.

A report reached Lithuania recently on the possibility that talks may be initiated between the USSR and Lithuania in the very near future. V. Landsbergis reacted like this to the news 25 September at a sitting of the republic's Supreme Soviet: Lithuania can not only not sign any Union treaties, it cannot conclude long-term economic agreements or economic agreements virtually without time restrictions until political questions are resolved.

Well, the immediate future will show who is actually sincerely concerned for the Lithuanian people and who is concerned for himself personally.

Independent Communist Official Rejects Party Law

LD0210023790 Moscow TASS in English 2154 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun]

[Text] Vilnius October 10 TASS—A high-ranking official of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party [LCP], which quit the Soviet communist party early this year, said the law on political parties, adopted recently by the Lithuanian parliament, "is directed against the Lithuanian Communist Party".

Vladimir Berezov, second secretary of the LCP Central Committee, told a press conference on Monday that the law, which prohibits the activity of communist party organisations at enterprises, "is totally undemocratic and violates human rights".

Commenting on results of the LCP'S Saturday plenum, which decided to convene the party's congress on December 1-2 this year, Berezov said that "this may be not the 21st Congress of the Independent Communist

Party of Lithuania, but the first congress of a reorganised party, as all policy documents of the LCP have a social democratic orientation".

Speaking about a referendum on whether the reorganised party should change its name and objectives, he said the plenum decided not to hold a referendum, but to discuss these issues at the congress.

It was said at the press conference that the reorganised LCP was already ripe for creating factions within itself and that a peasants' and a liberal factions might appear in the near future.

Many communists from rural areas oppose changes in the party's name and objectives.

Lithuanian Customs Posts To Police Exports

LD0210030990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2105 GMT 1 Oct 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The government of the Lithuanian Republic has temporarily prohibited the export of many foodstuffs and manufactured goods from the territory of Lithuania. The decision affects not only citizens but also enterprises and organizations. This measure is intended to ensure the equivalent exchange of goods with the Soviet Union.

Of course one cannot do without customs in such a situation. In the words of Algirdas Brazauskas, the vice premier, the latter should begin working on 1 October but will probably be slightly delayed. Nineteen checkpoints will be set up on roads leading out of Lithuania. So it will become difficult to take out, for example, over 200 grams of butter, 10 egge, 500 grams of sweets, and two boxes of matches.

Each person is permitted to take out goods worth not more than 50 rubles.

Latvian Minister Asks for Western Support

PM0210101790 Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 20 Sep 90 p 5

[Report by Bjarne Nitovuori on 19 September Helsinki press conference by Latvian Foreign Minister Janis Jurkans: "Latvia's Foreign Minister: The Situation Has Deteriorated"]

[Text] In the last few weeks the situation has deteriorated as far as the prospects of reaching an agreement with Moscow on Latvian independence are concerned, Latvian Foreign Minister Janis Jurkans indicated during a visit to Finland.

"Only a month ago we were optimistic when Latvia succeeded in reaching an agreement with Boris Yeltsin's Russian Federation, the first article of which recognizes the two parties as sovereign states and autonomous entities under international law. The agreement was to have been signed later in August, but it has still not been signed. Only a small part of the agreement—that affecting economic questions—was signed in Moscow last Friday [14 September]," Jurkans said at a press conference in Helsinki yesterday.

On 21 August discussions also began with Mikhail Gorbachev's Soviet Union, but after the first round of talks a break was made and the talks have not resumed after it.

At present nothing is happening between Riga and Moscow.

The economic situation is deteriorating rapidly in the Soviet Union, and consequently in the Baltic republics too. Since around 50 percent of Latvian industry is controlled from Moscow it is difficult for the Latvians to organize their own economic structure, Jurkans said.

"Gorbachev has offered us a new agreement on economic relations, but I am sure that the Baltic parliaments will not accept it. This could mean, and we have heard this from Yeltsin's camp, that if we do not accept the new Union treaty we must get ready for an economic blockade."

Jurkans said that Latvian representatives had met with President George Bush and Secretary of State James Baker and been given assurances that the United States and the West will never accept the Soviet annexation of the Baltic region.

Germany has also given assurances that the united Germany will not recognize the annexation, despite the fact that in the recent treaty covering the unification of the German states they recognize the current borders.

The problem now for the Balts is that people in the West are disinclined to raise the Baltic question lest they disturb relations between Moscow and Washington or jeopardize Gorbachev's reform process and position.

"That is a mistaken attitude. It is no longer possible for anyone to halt the process of dissolution in the Soviet Union. It could be uncontrolled and violent if it is not supported by the West.

"In the West people have difficulty in understanding how serious the process of dissolution in the Soviet Union is. People are thinking more about preserving the Soviet Union than about helping to make its dissolution peaceful," Jurkans said.

The Balts are now hoping that the West realizes that the Baltic question is an international issue, not an internal Soviet issue. It is the last unresolved question left after World War II.

"A suitable forum in which to discuss it would be the CSCE. And of course we would like to see it raised at the CSCE meeting in Paris in November, but we now understand after talks with politicians in Scandinavia, Finland, Germany, and so on that in all probability this will not happen," the Latvian foreign minister said.

The Germans have promised that the Baltic question will be raised on the international agenda in 1991.

"The Soviet Union is now so weak economically and so dependent on the West that this is the right moment to solve the Baltic question," he said.

In Finland Jurkans met with Foreign Minister Pertti Paasio—and briefly also with Prime Minister Harri Holkeri—and with a number of other Finnish opinion-formers.

He found it difficult to hide his disappointment with the weak Finnish support for the Letts' cause.

"I had hoped that I would be able to tell you more. We have received sympathy from Finland, but perhaps because of certain special reasons the Finns have been unable to say more than they have. Finnish businessmen have spoken in more specific terms, and I hope that in the very near future we will be able to tell you about concrete cooperation projects."

Before Jurkans came to Finland he also visited Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.

He said that the Scandinavians are now engaged in drawing up programs to help the Baltic countries in earnest. For example, Denmark has opened a cultural and information center in Riga and the Danish Industry Ministry has set up a special fund to promote Danish-Latvian joint ventures. Sweden is actively involved in developing economic relations and, according to Jurkans, Norway is perhaps the country giving the strongest political support to the Baltic countries.

Latvian Customs Begins Monitoring Imports

LD0210104590 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1000 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Text] The Customs Department is starting to monitor the Republic of Latvia's borders today. At the moment they are checking positions on the borders between Latvia and the Russian Federation, and Latvia and Belorussia. However, the transfer of prohibited goods to these republics is not possible through Estonia and Lithuania either, as an agreement is being reached with the customs officers of the other Baltic republics on corresponding checks at the borders of these republics.

RSFSR

Second Stage of Constituent Congress Assessed

Part One

90UN2867A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by A. Ilin, N. Kozhanov, A. Petrushov, and I. Podsvirov: "Formation. Notes on the Second Stage of the RSFSR Communist Party Constituent Congress"]

[Text] Moscow—**The second stage of the forum of Russian Communists took up only three days in a heavily booked September political calendar. But it was not upstaged by other very important events, even though we note that it was not given a great deal of attention by the press, and that in the assessments of a number of our colleagues a critical tone prevailed about which we will have something to say later. And for us PRAVDA people working at the congress, the newspaper readers are also making justified complaints about the inadequate coverage given to the discussion taking place in the Kremlin Palace. Well we accept the criticism and, as they say, we will draw our conclusions. Even in our comments today we shall probably not be able to talk about everything: An extensive range of key problems concerning the development of the party and society was touched on at the congress, and its results will undoubtedly be debated in the party organizations of Russia. We want to consider some of those problems on the basis of the congress materials and the meetings and interviews with those attending.**

It is common knowledge that the two main tasks it was designed to resolve were to complete the organizational formation of the Russian Communist Party and to adopt a program of action. The delegates elected the remaining members of the Central Committee as well as the chairman and members of the Central Control Commission. The Politburo and the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee secretaries were elected at the first, organizational plenum. Nevertheless, it is the general opinion that the formation of the Russian Communist Party is only just beginning, and virtually no time has been wasted in this: the changes through which the republic and the entire country are living today dictate the need for Communists to take a clear-cut position on cardinal problems.

This is why many of those attending the forum were dissatisfied that the congress was unable to resolve its second task—drawing up and adopting a program of action. And in the formal sense the complaints were justified. But if the main thing has essentially been achieved—the creation of the party—then what is happening now is the active process of formation.

Sharp Debate

When a new political force enters the public arena, the question of its strategic goals and aspiration is immediately raised: Whose interests does it express and what exactly can the people expect of it? And so it is understandable that the question of the new program of action for the newly formed Russian Communist Party became the first and most important point on the agenda during the second stage of the constituent congress.

We have all been able to follow from the stenographic record how events unfolded. And we have seen that the range of opinions prevented even the hope of the possibility of reaching a common opinion. And indeed, how could it be otherwise? On the one hand speakers were convinced that the draft drawn up by the congress preparatory committee was quite acceptable and was completely in line with the program statement issued by the 28th CPSU Congress, except perhaps for "certain stylistic differences" and "roughness." But others qualified the same draft as the latest collection of slogans and, even worse, little short of open revision of the decisions of the all-party congress. Thus for example V. Yelagin, Russian Komsomol Central Committee first secretary, contended that in the case of the program document adopted by the congress, in this version the Russian Communist Party immediately "acts in opposition both to the CPSU and to the Russian parliament and the RSFSR Komsomol." Nothing "rough" here!

Sharp polemic was usually answered with equally sharp polemic. And so already the deputy from the Moscow area, people's judge Yu. Slobodkin, announced categorically that "all the talk about our lack of preparedness to adopt a program... is objectively directed against our party and against bringing it out of its state of torpor...."

Whence the polarity of views? For as I. Osadchiy, the leader of the preparatory committee, showed from the congress dais, the draft itself was not prepared by amateurs. In addition to the 87 members of the committee; 153 members of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee; representatives of the four main trends and directions in the Russian Communist Party; and a large group of scholars, people's deputies, soviet and party workers, and workers and kolkhoz [collective farm] farmers worked on the document. And after it had been published up to 30,000 proposals and comments were sent in....

Given these kinds of impressive forces, can we agree with the conclusion that their hard labor—"every day from morning to late at night"—became just "the latest collection of slogans"? In this case the only thing left to do is follow the advice of A. Popelyshko, delegate from Kuybyshev Oblast, who said that "we have the documents of the 28th CPSU Congress and we will not think up any better, and we do not want worse documents."

But of course a party without its own program of action, without clearly defined strategic and tactical goals, is a nonsense. And of course the constituent congress and its preparatory committee have not labored in vain all these days. Yes, the document is contradictory, but the situation in the party itself was reflected as in a mirror. As it were, the Congress stopped halfway toward a program having clearly determined its initial positions and the disposition of forces, the right and left flanks, and illuminated the dangerous boundary beyond which a split is probable, even inevitable.

So what stopped the congress from moving on and taking things through to their conclusion? Delegates responded to this question in different ways, but the main arguments were seen clearly enough and are worthy of attention as lessons for tomorrow. One not unimportant reason is the process of drawing up and debating a program of action, and this time too, as in most cases, the primary party organizations were left on the sideline.

Two weeks elapsed between the publication of the draft and the start of the congress. Delegates were justifiably saying: Is this really adequate time for serious discussion? Again the haste, again the hope that everything would work itself out. But the times have changed and the lower cells in the party are in no way inclined to agree that the nationally proclaimed "power of the party masses" should remain, as before, some ephemeral and beautiful slogan. Moreover, wherever free discussion is based on the reality of life and is not aggravated by arrogance and the ambitions of particular rival theoretical opinions, it is much easier to achieve the unity of action at the level of the primary party organizations and in the midst of the labor collectives that is lacking today among communists. And not only in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic].

And here are some more of the ideas expressed by delegates during interviews. Time has been condensed incredibly, and the rapid unfolding of events produces almost daily changes in the picture of the country's political life. We are all theorizing about the communist prospective. This was really the main and basic thing stated in the program statement of the CPSU of which the Russian Communist Party is a part. So why should we duplicate it? Today the most important thing is to make clear to party members what their own immediate, specific tasks are. It is precisely this that should be the focus of attention if we want today's party to be a party of action; to solve the urgent problems which the people are living with and which they are worrying about at this time; to act as the party of Lenin acted at the dawn of the century when it wrote into its program clauses that were clear and understood by all people of labor, as for example,the struggle for the eight-hour work day....

We think that these are considerations worthy of attention. And somehow it did not sit well when some of the delegates who spoke from the dais, expressing precisely these kinds of quite specific proposals, were greeted with open applause from some of the audience. Surely the delegate from Murmansk Oblast, V. Zaytsev, could have managed without this. We are not about to repeat his words about tact and about the level of political standards, which set one's teeth on edge. But what if a Communist suggested introducing something as seditious as that into the program of action? Perhaps some of the zealots of "ideological purity" were upset by the proposal to organize a school for managers under the aegis of the party? For of course the party needs experienced business experts today because under market conditions it will have to engage seriously in entrepreneurial activity. And it may be even more necessary tomorrow—this is not excluded—when it becomes one of the conditions on which the party's survival depends.

The decisions reached on the program of action adopted by the congress are known. The main directions for the activity of the Russian Communist Party will be worked out on the basis of the dialogue that has taken place. After thorough discussion in all the party organizations, these must be approved at a joint session of the party Central Committee and Central Control Commission no later than December this year.

The Individual and the Economy

One does not have to be a seer to predict that in the debates at the congress the most keen discussion took place on economic problems. Even when the agenda was still being fixed delegate P. Koshel, director of a kolkhoz in Tomsk Oblast, proposed that it include "a discussion of the economic question." "I think," he said, "that when they return from the congress, Communists will first and foremost be asked questions precisely about the switch to a market economy and about the economic situation in Russia and the country as a whole." And even though these problems were not included on the agenda for the congress as a separate point, almost everyone who spoke mentioned them.

Here are just a few fragments from the congress debate. And incidentally, it was precisely on this point that the delegates at the Russian forum are being accused of conservatism and other sins.

[I. Vtorushin, milling machine operator at the "Drevmash" Scientific-Production Association machine tool plant] On the subject of the market, this idea is eliciting contradictory opinions. In fact, whereas earlier all roads led to communism, now they all lead to the market. If it is a market where one pole is a paradise and the other is destitution, then the people do not need it. I think that this is exactly what it will be.... I believe that the different scenarios for the switch to the market should be made public and debated.

No matter what the slogan used, if a policy promotes declining living standards, lack of discipline, general animosity, and bloodshed, then that policy is not in the interests of the people.

[Yu. Prokofyev, first secretary of the CPSU Moscow City Committee] Privatization of the economy will inevitably lead to major political changes, and we should not therefore remain indifferent to how and in whose interests the transfer of the means of production to private ownership takes place. Our goal should be to do it in the interests of the people. It is workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia who should be the owners of factories, plants, kolkhozes, and cooperatives; not those who have illegal money, the mafia clans and groups. And the party, which defends the interests of the workers, should say how this is done instead of repeating like a mantra the words about devotion to all forms of ownership and a course toward a socialist market....

[V. Shiryayev, general director of the "Tulskiy patronnyy zavod" Production Association] ...discipline and a sense of responsibility to society should dominate in any system. Otherwise there is anarchy—the mother of disorder. And we are now observing the start of this. Yes, sooner or later we must have discipline and order in the country, even though some people really do not want this. But we are asking our people this: perestroyka without end, without sugar or flour or macaroni or tobacco and many other very essential products that until recently we never even thought about; or bringing basic order to the sphere of production and consumption; and a purging of society from corrupt elements, the mafia, and embezzlers of state property?

[A. Churin, party committee secretary at the Sinarskiy pipe plant (Sverdlovsk Oblast)] ...the program for switching to market relations and a package of laws needed following their review in the USSR and RSFSR Supreme Soviets should be published in full, together with candid socioeconomic predictions for the various population groups, and then submitted to a national referendum. We believe that the transitional period to market relations cannot be handed over to the tender mercies of the elements. [end Churin]

We see that there are different opinions and different approaches. For a majority the market is perceived as a necessity, if an intimidating one; for others whose position was expressed most sharply by Ye. Tachayeva, a grinding machine operator from the "Uralmash" plant who was invited to the congress, it is an alien idea for the people that has been foisted on them by a group of economists and a press that constantly exaggerates things. But to be honest, we would not like to divide those who took part in the debate into the "purists" and "nonpurists," "democrats" and "conservatives" on this basis alone; as one of the delegates here rightly remarked, we have no shortages at all when it comes to pinning labels on people. It is the more surprising that not only among journalists but also among scholars no attempts have been made to understand, while they castigate any doubter. Or is it that they do not know how dearly our science has paid—and not only economic science—for the fact that for decades any doubts about the correctness of official theories was regarded as criminal?

When one considers this discussion now, several days after the congress, one understands how difficult it is for people to grasp the reasons for the crisis in the economy and the different scenarios proposed for reform. Obviously the economics scholar and the worker, the party worker and the economic leader, the peasant and the student, each has his own truth and the rightness of his own positions and views. One proceeds from his life experience, another from book knowledge. Perhaps we should give everyone a rating and then give preference either to the scientific approach or the life experience approach. But who today is prepared to play the role of omniscient examiner?

Our country and our people have endured dozens and hundreds of economic, social, and political experiments large and small, and the results do not instill confidence. Is this not why today no one wants to believe the words and the promises and the optimistic predictions? Because more often than not our common hopes have not been realized, and the cheerful pictures have disappeared like mirages. Instead there has been an abundance of distressing consequences and we have not even now yet managed to avoid them: Who can be trusted this time to make things different?

And here is another, perhaps unexpected thought: Must the Russian Communist Party really have its own economic program? Yes, we have become accustomed to having all programs—even purely technical programs such as the development of power engineering, land improvement, or the railroad network—being based first and foremost on the party, and have debated them and adopted them at congresses and Central Committee plenums or meetings of the Politburo. Party plans, which correspond closely to the slogans, have been announced as the people's plans; but if the good intentions were not matched by the results, reasons and explanations have always been found and no one, including particular leaders in economic and other organs, have considered themselves directly to blame. The blame has been dissolved into collective responsibility, or more accurately irresponsibility shielded by the name of the party. And so perhaps the time has come to look at these things differently? For once the party is no longer the state party and must learn political work methods; then work on economic programs must be handed over to specialists—managers, scientists, and labor collectives now finally blessed with independence. And the programs will have to be approved by the organs of soviet power, from top to bottom, which will enjoy every opportunity and power to do so.

We foresee the questions. So will the party be left on the sidelines in finding solutions to economic problems that will decide the fate of the peoples in the republics? In this case, will the interests of working people not suffer—the very people the party is supposed to defend? Will the very foundations of our social order not be endangered or deformed? Radical questions, and we cannot dismiss them as the energetic reformers try to, convinced that they are all unnecessary ideological matters that should have been discarded long ago. And it must be a question not of pushing the party aside, but of its rejection of the command-administrative habits which are now outdated, and its mastery of really new political methods; of an ability to resolve the fate of a particular idea not according to what might be called its party affiliation but according to its economic and political effectiveness. In October 1917 Lenin was not afraid to propose to the Second Congress of the Soviets the Decree on Land, based on a socialist revolutionary program, because it was founded on concrete instructions from the peasants that had been ascertained by millions of people who had worked the wooden plow....

Unfortunately, the date of the Russian Communists' forum came at a time when the delegates could judge only approximately the concepts for economic reform put forward by the government and by the S. Shatalin group. This is probably why the disputes about the market at the congress often became, let us be candid, superficial even though it concerned the question of the life of the people and the destiny of the country. But we think that the debate at the congress may have been useful for those who drew up the two main programs.

Is this also not why future reforms that have been prepared by tradition under "laboratory" conditions scare us? Do they fully reflect the important concerns and needs of simple working people? In trying finally to make the people happy with the latest panacea against all ills it would not be a bad idea to listen to those for whom the plans and programs are being created, to those who bear and will bear the main burden of the switch to the new forms of economic life.

In our opinion an area for Communist Party activity is opening up here, namely to ensure a reliable association between radical transformations in the economy and the economic and social interests of millions of people; to ensure the participation of Communists in the legislative activity of the parliament and the soviets at all levels; to implement a new economic policy for the good of the workers using the methods and forms properly inherent in a democratic and legitimate state; and to clarify here in fact who is a conservative and who a democrat. Now is not the time to look for the bone of contention but to help the peoples of Russia to extricate themselves in a worthy manner from the crisis situation.

If we look at the economic essence of market relations they do not contradict the socialist idea. Let us look at the experience of the developed countries in the West where socialist or social democratic parties are in power. Those who have observed, not from some square as a tourist but really studied their experience, know what a major role is played by the policy of these parties in guaranteeing a proper living standard for working people, and in mitigating as far as possible the burden of the negative—and these do exist—consequences of market spontaneity. Yes, and on the subject of this "spontaneity" it is possible to talk very conditionally about its "banks" which, unnoticed at first glance, have quite definitely spread through the system of legislative and other measures by the state, the trade unions, and other political institutions.

It has been stated, and correctly, that politics is the concentrated expression of economics; but even the influence of party policy and activity to ensure the humane nature of the economy is undoubtedly great. And the Russian Communist Party has much to do to ensure that the last component in the triad made up of the individual, freedom, and the economy is not turned onto the other two only in a negative fashion; and to ensure that rigorous action in the transformation of the economy is really well considered and realistic. Only then will it have the support of the people.

Part Two

90UN2867B Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Sep 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report by A. Ilin, N. Kozhanov, A. Petrushov, and I Podsvirov: "Formation. Notes on the Second Stage of the RSFSR Communist Party Constituent Congress"]

[Text]

Who Are the Communists Defending?

Moscow—Perhaps what was heard most often from the dais at the Russian forum of Communists was the cardinal question of who the Communist Party should defend right from the time that it is formed, and whose interests is it designed to safeguard first and foremost? To judge from the makeup of the leading organs of the Communist Party of Russia Central Committee elected at the congress, the party represents the interests of all social strata in society including the majority of workers and peasants; the scientific and technical and creative intelligentsia; and workers in party, soviet, and economic organs. Notwithstanding, workers continue to leave the ranks of the CPSU. What are the reasons for this alarming and extremely negative process? Why are people dissatisfied?

Many delegates insisted that it is essential to provide clear and exact answers without any kind of political archness. Only comprehensive analysis and an honest explanation of the causes of the crisis in the party will help in defining the strategy and tactics for action of the republic party organization. In our view, it was very democratic to offer the floor at one meeting to four representatives of different platforms and movements. We recall once again the proposals of substance offered in those statements.

[M. Popov, participant in the Initiative Congress of the Communists of Russia and professor at the Leningrad State University] We believe that the Communist Party that has been created should be a party of the working class and thus for all workers, and that it should be a combination of scientific socialism and the working movement. It should not be a party of talk but a party of action, a party of communist initiative.... It is trying to achieve power for the workers, but it does not concern itself only with how to transfer power to other parties....

[V. Lipitskiy, representative of the communist reformers of the Democratic Platform within the CPSU and department chief in the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism] It is the duty of Communists to promote the kind of transformation of the economic system that would make it possible to defend the interests of the workers not only under market conditions, but—and this is the main thing—with the help of the market. The choice of path—which we cannot escape and from which we cannot hide behind talk—will determine whether the party is the locomotive for the most progressive trends or becomes a car coupled to it at some small, remote station....

[Yu. Yegorov, representative of the Marxist Platform within the CPSU and brigade leader at the Moscow "Skorost" Mechanism Plant] We believe that the Communist Party of the RSFSR could take the legislative initiative in transferring a significant proportion of small and medium-sized state enterprises to collective ownership of the workers employed there by enactment or for some symbolic payment.... Association of such enterprises into popular concerns and larger complexes would lead to the formation of true popular ownership during the process of historical development. It is clear to everyone that the most critical problem is food. It is time to understand that the concept "we shall feed the people" is in principle unable to provide results. It is essential to move categorically to the directly opposite concept: "Do not interfere with the people feeding themselves."

[A. Zolotov, representative of the organizing committee of the "Communist Initiative" youth movement and docent at the Gorkiy State University] Even just a few years ago hope for society's renewal was inspiring our youth which believed in effective forms of management and a strengthening of social justice. And young people were trying to help that process. But things have changed: The economy has been made capitalist and life is worsening for tens of millions of people, while the people in the "shadow economy" are growing rich. It is not surprising that young people have become disillusioned and that the Komsomol is in crisis. [end Zolotov]

We see that despite the differences in assessing the situation and the methods whereby perestroyka may be accomplished, most agree with the viewpoint that during the switch to a market economy the worker himself—the creator and producer of material and spiritual blessings—should not suffer. If we discard the obviously extremist and polemical "muddles," "conservatives" and "democrats" and "centrists" and "leftist radicals" are essentially agreed. It seems everyone is concerned for the fate of the simple worker and the prospect of possible impoverishment of the working masses, and of the specter of impending unemployment. If this becomes a fact today it will assume a threatening scale, and a sharp polarization of forces and stratification of society will be inevitable. Some will lose their rights, others will acquire too many. And the rich "shadow economy" people will finally impose their will on the poor. In what sense can there be humane and democratic socialism then? This is what delegates were asking with alarm.

People no longer accept starry-eyed assurances and they do not believe in "programs" and cheerful promises. The latest inevitable "casualties" are no longer in a mood for patience. Why, we say, have the workers started to leave the party? By no means the last reason, and this was repeatedly stated at the congress, is because there is disillusionment in society and lack of faith in the success of perestroyka. These kinds of sentiments must be considered. This means that we need real, positive efforts to safeguard the interests of the workers. We need concrete facts and proof of compliance with decisions. Under the conditions of the transitional period, social safeguards for the individual must become the basis of the RSFSR Communist Party's activity.

Hence also the congress call to all party organizations in the republic to focus attention primarily on the affairs of and show real concern for the workers and problems of social justice. It is time to cast aside ambitions and unnecessary scholastic disputation and clear the air of offense and differences; to get down to the difficult, rough work. Unfortunately many party members have forgotten about that kind of work. This perhaps was why V. Yelagin, first secretary of the RSFSR Komsomol Central Committee, uttered these bitter words:

"While the party organizations were very busy with their own problems, the situation in the Komsomol changed significantly. Perhaps this is why some party leaders who could not tear themselves away from their work and come to the Komsomol auditorium are astonished that they are not finding the usual understanding and agreement.... It can be said with confidence that young people will not follow a party that is still only beginning to work on a 'modern concept of socialism,' a party that is being renewed only in its declarations but in reality does not understand young people, is not rejuvenating its thinking or structure, and does not even have its own youth policy."

Say what you will, this is a serious reproach. And repeated warnings were heard at the congress that unemployment threatens primarily young people. Young men and women need not only active social but also moral protection. It is no secret that it is precisely in the youth milieu that the cultivation of banality and sex, and the propaganda of gain and a "romantic" desire for riches, exert an extremely negative effect. The implantation of such attitudes is also being promoted by some Komsomol committees and by the media.

But is increased speculation that acquires the character of economic brigandage capable of distorting the souls and the destiny of millions? The alarm of the Russian Communists was expressed in particular by a delegate from Dagestan, M. Gasonov, a brigade leader at an electrothermal equipment plant:

"At this moment speculators are doing what they like, how they like, and with impunity. Is this not true? This is not a trivial matter, comrades.... Speculators grow up to be corrupt persons, and a mafia is organized through these kinds of smaller undertakings. With small steps they come to the 'high peaks' and become an opposition to everything that the Communist Party and the parliamentary corps want to do."

Questions relating to justice and social and moral safeguards for the individual become their own kind of litmus paper which in the very near future will reveal the vitality of the party and the public movements and separate the truth from falsehood, veracity from the camouflage of intentions. To judge from the debate that took place, the Communist Party of Russia deems comprehensive safeguards for the worker a vital matter.

From Defense to Action

This was the leitmotif of the congress. But here we need to make a slight digression. It is common knowledge that some people are looking at the creation of the Communist Party of Russia from a position of hope, but others.... This is about them. Some critics of the Communist Party of Russia are perfectly well aware that already they cannot get rid of it. The party of the Russian Communists has emerged as an organic part of the workers, not by some order from above but by the will of the party masses in the republic. The critics are therefore supposedly speaking out not against the creation of the Communist Party of Russia, nor are they against its lofty and noble ideals—the rebirth of Russia's spiritual and moral initiative and its real inclusion in historical action. No, they would favor this but they have their own understanding of Russia tomorrow and the role of the Communist Party in that tomorrow. In other words, the purpose of the wave of criticism poured down on the Communist Party of Russia is a trend to make it an appendage of soviet and economic organs and remove it further and further from independent policy in the renewal of society. Hence, to put it mildly the squall about the "fabrications" directed at the constituent congress. We recall the articles, interviews, and essays carried in certain publications and we clearly see the discredit aimed at the first steps of the Communist Party of Russia. What is surprising is that even yesterday its "supporters" were sparing neither words nor emotions for the idea of the rebirth of the party, but when the Communist Party of Russia came through the thorns and became a reality, amicably and in unison they started to talk about the woebegone intellectual level of the congress, the absence of "theoretical discussion" or "conceptual search" at the congress, and the speeches "odious to the point of wretchedness." Delegates were not even given credit for an adequate degree of education and civilization, and were accused of "military directness" and a "thick sense of class" as well as of turgid thinking and even poor vocabulary. Even the desire of the Russian Communists to cooperate with all progressive forces was doubted. In short, there has never been such aggressive "democratic" extremism intolerant (as is now obvious) of any kind of different thinking.

We are reminded of a certain "cultured" lady who exclaimed with fickleness "Ah, I ain't gonna like this young man!" Even though she had never even seen him....

There is no need for us to comment that the misuse of word tags is the most common phenomenon in politics. But we do remark that it has never been used to such a degree! And are those who wish to speak devoid of political culture and a sense of civilization? No, this was certainly no innocent performance. Its aim is clear: to wreck or politically nullify the second stage of the congress. We see, however, that they did not succeed in this.

Yes, we repeat that answers were not provided to all the questions and no program of action was adopted. But the debates on it showed the high sense of responsibility on the part of delegates for the fate of the Communist Party. We shall not be exaggerating if we say that in recent years this has been perhaps the only party congress where those attending approached with such sharp criticism the work on the fundamental decisions and candidly and honestly admitted that in today's circumstances a more reliable political barometer is needed, the kind of barometer that would arm the Communists of Russia with a knowledge of the specific actions capable of rallying them in a true combat organization that expresses the interests of the workers. A combat organization that is on the offensive, not an organization whose purpose is to defend against intrigue and attack.

In our opinion the very fact that no basic document was adopted testifies that the Communist Party of Russia has switched from defense to action. For a negative result is also a result, and sometimes a very instructive one. So what does this force us to think about? First and foremost that it is finally time finally for the Communists of Russia to acquire a more social viewpoint and to become more organized.

Delegate O. Latsis was right: The program does not, properly speaking, even contain the tasks for the Communists of Russia, and there is no concept of how to express them. I understand, said this scholar, that this is difficult. Indeed. Russia and the Soviet Union are almost one and the same thing. It is very difficult to say which tasks are special for Russia and which for the Soviet Union. Perhaps it is impossible. Perhaps we must say that we cannot think of anything else.

Let us stop there for a moment. We have already commented on the opinions of some delegates to the effect that two weeks between the publication of the draft and the congress was too short a time for serious discussion. Now let us cite the opposing opinions. P. Zhilin, a kolkhoz [collective farm] chairman from Rostov Oblast, disagrees with the claim that the Communists did not have time to study the document. His farm is located about 460 kilometers from Rostov and there is no hard-top road to it. Nevertheless, the rural Communists obtained the draft in good time and discussed it. "Those who did not want to did not know about the draft." Between ourselves, these are prophetic words! In fact, why did other delegates have to spout so much hot air? And who believes that O. Latsis—a Muscovite, first deputy chief editor of the journal KOMMUNIST, and doctor of sciences—found two weeks to be insufficient to study a quite brief document and make his own comments and proposals? Is it that he did not want to? And the other scholars, the intellect of Russia? There you have it. Hence the quick sentence passed on the draft, the reluctance to improve on it either before or during the course of the congress. Hence the attention to the weak aspects of the drafts and the silence about its proper provisions.

Meanwhile, the "courageous" delegates who tried to "disrupt the course of the congress" "started to clap their hands" precisely because, apart from "shooting down" the draft, they have proposed nothing sensible. And they could not suggest that this was not part of their plans.

And so dear reader, do not believe those who through their supposedly objective remarks about the congress are, to put it mildly, distorting the atmosphere at the party forum and disparaging its political importance. Better take up the stenographic records—they have been published in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA—and study them carefully. And you will see that there was everything in the Kremlin Palace—the desire to "inflict painful wounds," sallies against those who disagreed in their thinking, and even "cockfighting." But it is impossible not to notice the main thing. At the congress there was a debate on urgent Russian issues, constructive discussion, and a search for answers to the thousand and one questions in our complex and contradictory perestroyka. We emphasize once again that the polemic did not descend to a petty and trivial knockabout exchange of different opinions or to various kinds of jabbing and digging. The congress demonstrated the unflinching desire to defend a role for the Communist Party that stands above ambition and pretension, and in which the highest common human values are paramount in its activity. This particularly irritates the radical aggressive minority which considers itself the monopoly interpreter of "democracy," "glasnost," and "justice."

No, it was not for the fine words he pronounced or for his military bearing that the hall greeted with stormy applause N. Stolyarov, senior teacher from the Air Force Academy imeni Yu.A. Gagarin. Concluding his brilliant speech, he said that today the fate of Russia depends largely on public agreement and he appealed to all people's deputies, Communists and nonparty people, and the representatives of all democratic, progressive movements: Let us unite, rally, and direct our efforts toward saving Russia and its honor! Incidentally, this was also "not to the liking" of the political extremists.

Civic agreement! The desire for this was also seen in the debate on the acute problem of relations between the party and the soviets.

"This is undoubtedly a key problem, and a far from simple one if we take into account the fact that certain forces are raising the old slogan of 'soviets without Communists' for far from seemly reasons." N. Sapozhnikov, a congress deputy and first secretary of the Udmurt Oblast Party Committee, spoke with concern about the fact that the opposition seen between the Communist Party and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is stratifying the ranks of the Communists and is being transferred to the mutual relations between the local organs of power and the party committees. Under these conditions any program, even the wisest, may be just a collection of proper phrases. It was the opinion of the deputies that it is high time to sit down at the negotiating table and engage in dialogue, not through the press but openly and face to face.

The constituent congress expressed itself in favor of close cooperation between the Communist Party and all democratic forces in Russia. There could be a main consensus on joint efforts against those who are trying to exacerbate the political situation by taking advantage of the economic difficulties and the fickle mass consciousness.

And there is yet another problem. It is the matter of national tension. Both in general and in particular the congress stated its support for the goals proclaimed by the First RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies. That is, it favors political sovereignty for the republic but a sovereignty, as delegates emphasized, that has nothing in common with Russia's self-alienation from the affairs and concerns of the USSR. The fates of the peoples of the Soviet Union are indivisible. The approach is the same with respect to autonomous formations. The Russian Federation is a voluntary association of sovereign peoples based on a conscious decision. The negotiating process is a matter for the soviets. The party committees exert their influence on the course of the negotiations via the Communist deputies, and they shape a healthy public opinion and help people to work out their unbiased views on the idea of sovereignty.

The solution to this problem is an agonizing one with great costs. In some places the unmanageability of the situation is a bitter reality that has tragically damaged people's fates. Yu. Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee, called for practical and urgent steps to help the refugees and for concern to be shown about the fate of the Russian-speaking population in the republics and autonomous formations.

Congress delegates noted that all Russian social and age groups should be regarded by the party as a bastion and should sense its support in a practical way.

From defense to action! This means first and foremost every possible development of the Communists themselves and of their individual capabilities, initiative, and independence in reaching the right decisions. The emergence of the multiparty system, competition, and the free play of the various forces require that the primary party organizations turn to political activity and become in fact a party for the social protection of the workers.

Such was the range of discussion at the congress. And there were surprises too. An appeal was made from the dais to go back to the initial point of perestroyka, to 1985. The overwhelming majority at the forum, however, did not support this "tempting" suggestion. Of course if we live poorly, so be it; but say what you will, spiritual freedom is sweeter and one can breathe more easily in its atmosphere, despite everything! And what there was not at the congress was that nostalgia for the purity of teaching and monolithic nature and ideological luster. On the contrary, throughout all three days there was a rethinking of the awareness of the party role in the life of society and the state.

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Briefed on Yeltsin Health

LD0210091690 Moscow TASS in English 0906 GMT 2 Oct 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Yuriy Kozmin and Pavel Ostrov]

[Text] Moscow October 2 TASS—After a week of work in committees and commissions, the Russian parliament met today in a plenary session. According to the agenda, deputies will consider the socio-economic situation in the republic on the eve of its transition to market relations and a package of documents connected with the provision of pensions.

Opening today's plenary session, first deputy chairman of parliament Ruslan Khasbulatov briefed those present on Russian President Boris Yeltsin's health. Yeltsin was in a road accident last week.

Doctors recommend Yeltsin to stay in bed for some time, but he has not been following their advice, Khasbulatov said.

Yeltsin intends to preside over the plenary session by the end of this week or the beginning of next week, he added.

Analyses of '500 Days' Implementation Program

Supporter Defends Policy

PM2309160090 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Sep 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Interview with G.A. Yavlinskiy, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, by N. Garifullina; place and date not given: "Paths to a Market Economy"—first four paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] The country is once again glued to the television screens: The Union parliament is discussing ways to make the transition to the market, and it is in point of fact a question of what kind of country we will live in. At least three programs have now ended up under "fire" from people's deputies: the Shatalin-Yavlinskiy program, the Abalkin program, and the composite program. The first of them, known as the "500 days" program, has already been approved on the whole by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. Russian parliamentarians took nine days to adopt a resolution which will accomplish a fundamental revolution in the political and economic system and the way of life of 150 million people. Alternative programs were not even considered there, and the program was passed almost unanimously—with just one vote "against."

But a heated debate is continuing in the Union parliament. The characteristic thing is that all the speakers, as in the Russian parliament, appeal to the people. Meanwhile, readers are putting questions—a lot of them—to the editorial office. "What kind of a system will there be in the country if man's exploitation of man is permitted?" "The foreign press bluntly writes that the USSR will now take the capitalist path. Is this true?" And these are still not the most acute questions. One of them is as follows: "All parliamentarians speak in the people's name. But what will the people themselves say?"

The anxieties and fears are understandable: The country is faced with a historic choice. But what do the programs' authors think about this?

Today Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, the 38-year-old deputy chairman of Russia's Council of Ministers—his is the third signature on the concept and program of "Transition to the Market" after S. Shatalin and N. Petrakov—introduces the "500 days" to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's readers.

[Garifullina] Grigoriy Alekseyevich, I realize it is an almost impossible task to set forth such a large-scale program in brief. And yet I will risk asking you to dwell on its chief aspects.

[Yavlinskiy] I do not think there is any need to speak about the profound crisis of the socioeconomic system which has struck all our existing structures and exposed their total unviability. Quite a lot has been said about this. Our aim is to extricate ourselves as quickly as possible from the bottomless pit in which we find ourselves. And so our program's first task is to give the ruble full weight so that people can be sure when they get their wages that they are not worthless notes, and that they can use this money to buy maybe not everything they would like at first but at least everything they need, so that the ruble once again becomes an incentive for work and people know that by making an endeavor and exerting more effort they will be able both to earn more and to do more for their family, home, and hearth. Where is the rub? Owing to a whole number of events recently, we have seen very serious variations in the purchasing power of the ruble....

[Garifullina] ...Inflation on a gigantic scale, as a result of which the ruble is worth nothing...?

[Yavlinskiy] Yes, the ruble has begun to lose, lose, lose. But for a number of reasons we have embarked on huge expenditures—we have promised an increase in pensions, now for mothers, now for children. But when we promise all this we do not fully realize that the sum which we give is, in actual fact, small. But if in addition it is also worthless and the money has nothing in it, then to put it mildly this is not very good with regard to our own people.

So the first stage of the program is an attempt to do everything possible to restore statehood, to restore the currency. For no state can exist without its own ruble. And we are very categorically opposed to all measures aimed at the dollarization of our economy. We believe that this is extremely dangerous both economically and, if you like, politically. We do not consider it possible that now in this situation, and still less in the future—under no conditions at all—the dollar could have the same right to circulate in our economy as the ruble. This must not happen. Of course, any of our people must have the opportunity to buy and sell currency. But this does not mean that it must have dominant rights here.

Many people complain now that economic ties are collapsing and no one wants to do anything or fulfill anything. This, roughly, is the case. But we see the reasons elsewhere. Our opponents include the total collapse of discipline. This is so, it is true, but it is not the chief thing. Money has ceased to act! "I do not need you and your orders! I need only barter. You give me cement, and I will give you coal. If you do not give me.... I am not interested in money, since I cannot use it to get what I need." In our view, this is the prime cause of severed ties.

So as you might have now noticed, there are two principal points. First, the ruble must acquire full weight for people, for consumers. Second, the ruble must also start working in the economic mechanism, it must unite enterprises and arrange ties. And third, commonplace pride. Yes, it must be our pride—our currency, our ruble. Another important point: The program is structured so as first to rectify matters and then to do everything necessary to ensure that the crisis is not repeated.

[Garifullina] So then, what must be done? With what do you invest the concept "everything necessary"?

[Yavlinskiy] The largest possible number of people must be given the opportunity to do what they want and what they can—collectives, individual citizens, cooperatives of every stripe, etc.—must be given the opportunity to work freely in all senses. And corresponding measures must be taken from the state's viewpoint—to separate the bank from the state, prohibit the bank from giving the state credit and finance, and create corresponding structures which will ensure most-favored status for independent producers; to engage mechanisms which will regulate the dynamics of the prices of consumer goods, let us say; and to create mechanisms of social protection which will guarantee its population against big differences, falls, and increases since there will undoubtedly be problems at the first stages while this whole mechanism gets ground in and starts working. The population must feel these problems to the least degree.

It is very important to create a competitive environment. But when I speak of competition I mean competition in the best sense of the concept, when you want to prove that you can do something better than someone else; that it will turn out better with you; that you are more competent, professional, etc. I want to say that in the entire history of its existence mankind has invented nothing more efficient that the market economy. If we master it, we will scramble out of the pit and be able to gain access to the achievements of world civilization.

[Garifullina] It is known that it is proposed to implement the "500 days" program stage by stage. What are these stages?

[Yavlinskiy] There are four stages. During the first 100 days—from 1 October through the beginning of 1991—it is a program of emergency measures.

The next stage is from the 100th through the 250th day: liberalization of prices and tough financial restrictions. Its task is to create favorable conditions for forming a full-blooded market. The situation on the consumer market must improve noticeably. The first stage of the land reform is to be completed by the spring of 1991.

From the 250th through the 400th day: stabilization of the market, continuation of the process of reducing state control, and activation of antimonopoly policy. State control over the prices of approximately 70-80 percent of output and services is to be removed toward the end of the 400 days. Ruble convertibility is introduced.

And finally, from the 400th through the 500th day: the start of the upsurge. The main direction of work in this period is considerable progress in reducing state control and in privatizing and demonopolizing the economy, and the activation of structural-investment policy. The economy will already be able to rely on the market mechanism.

[Garifullina] The question of ownership is fundamental to your program. As is known we have all-Union ownership, and now that the republics are adopting declarations of sovereignty, each one states that it has a right to part of the all-Union property, to the currency stock, etc. Nevertheless, how is it proposed to divide the property—among republics or among people? What is your approach?

[Yavlinskiy] There are certain laws—I would call them dangerous since they proceed from speculative or purely political considerations, and on coming into contact with life they enter into a very complex relationship with it. The Law on Ownership is such a law. Why? It is constructed on the basis of statized, nationalized [etotizirovannyy, ogosudarstvlennyy] thinking. And there is an argument over this law—how we will share out property among the new, **nonunified** states having taken all this from the **unified** state?

But we proceed from the premise that it is absolutely immaterial to a person—if he is a healthy, normal person—whether this property belongs to the state called the USSR or to the state called the RSFSR. He might rejoice for half a day because all this is now called Russian, but the next day it occurs to him that all this is not so important because his living conditions are not changing. And they cannot change because nationalization has its origins in the very mechanism which operates objectively under these conditions.

In adopting the Law on Ownership, some people propose defining the property of a republic, an autonomy, an oblast, a kray, a city, and a rayon. This idea is flawed. In this case the process of the transfer of property to citizens will become a process of dividing among governments, i.e. among officials, among regions, among I do not know whom. It is already getting ridiculous.

A few weeks ago I found myself in a room where the Law on Local Self-Management was being elaborated, and I was rebuked there in all seriousness for the fact that the government does not have a stand on whether there can be rayon property in cities. I asked: **Who** is a rayon? What kind of "historical community" is it? Who among us feels that he belongs to some rayon? No, they said, give us the property and we will privatize it, realize it, and take whatever percentage we want, but we will not let the city do so.

I do not know, maybe this makes sense from the viewpoint of the purity of juridical science, but from the economic viewpoint it is absurd. The task consists in giving property to people, not to republics. And the construction on which the Union Law on Ownership is based is very dangerous. I do not want to frighten anyone, but if the republics now start ascertaining among themselves what belongs to whom, that is terrible! There are clearly no limits.

Therefore I would consider that it is necessary to proceed from the premise that what we have today is property belonging to the whole people in the sense that it is state property, and it is necessary to ensure that it belongs to people, not to state officials. I am simply convinced that people will cope with it better. I am convinced.

[Garifullina] I would like to learn in greater detail how you see the privatization process and what its "technology" is.

[Yavlinskiy] I believe that it will begin with the adoption of a law on privatization, i.e. on the process of the transfer of property. Let us assume that an operation to reduce state control begins in the city of Novokuznetsk. All procedural and financial questions have been resolved. Three months before this a full list of what is for sale is drawn up: a store on such-and-such a street, a shop, a factory, machine tools, etc. The price and the possibility of the delivery of documents are announced, and two months later the rayon newspaper reports who intends to buy what. The law must prescribe the sum above which it is necessary to declare income. I believe that certain protectionist measures are admissible for a given region and for local inhabitants. The movement of capital will come later.

All these questions were of interest to the miners working in our group. Deputies asked even more about this, for the discussion of the program took over a week—at first

12-14 hours a day in the commissions and committees, then separately in the Supreme Soviet chambers, and only then at a plenary sitting of the session. On the whole, as you see, it was possible to attain understanding.

[Garifullina] Which forms of privatization would you propose?

[Yavlinskiy] Very diverse ones. Joint-stock forms of buying back and selling enterprises and creating cooperatives on their basis and the transfer of state enterprises to a commercial operating regime—i.e. it continues to belong to the state, but is totally independent and only gives it part of its income while the state appoints the chief manager (director).

[Garifullina] Grigoriy Alekseyevich, who will acquire all this and how will the shadow economy participate in privatization? According to official data, more than 40 million people in our country now live below the official poverty line.

[Yavlinskiy] I believe that there are twice as many.

[Garifullina] All the more! The press has already carried reports that with the transfer to a market economy we will have approximately 40-50 million unemployed. They will swell this huge army of unfortunate people. Therefore I cannot fail to ask this question: All the same, which of us will buy plants, factories, land...?

[Yavlinskiy] I will try to answer. I would not want to enter into particular polemics, but I want to say that 40-50 million is a manifest exaggeration.

[Garifullina] But there will be unemployed?

[Yavlinskiy] There are even now. When we were making the program, the association of the unemployed—we do have such a thing!—gave me the figure of 23 million unemployed. True, I cannot vouch for its accuracy.

But the question of who will buy is a question of the price. Everything depends on what the price for all this will be. My view of these things is that we do not yet have a market or market prices, and so we have a right, taking this factor into account, to set prices so that the maximum number of people have access to property, at least at the first stage. Later, when the market starts working, then of course prices will rise, but this will be the next stage. In addition, we do not set the financial task of extorting some huge sums of money from the population. We reckon that if the process of reducing state control is quite successful, then at the first stage, with its help, we will balance our financial position because at present there are absolutely no goods to buy with money. Our idea is to take from the state what previously was not sold at all—in principle—and to give it to people for money.

I will cite a very simple example. A lot of military equipment is now working on kolkhozes [collective farms] and state farms—for example, trucks are gathering the harvest. Why should we not let rural people keep them? Let us sell them to kolkhoz members for 10,000, 15,000, or 20,000 rubles [R]. This is not that expensive. They will buy them as they will buy Zhigulis—however many you give them. And they will buy up Volgas right away, will they not? But there are none of these Zhigulis and Volgas while there are trucks. So let us sell them. What will they do with the trucks? Work, take vegetables to market, and they will gather the same harvest next year not with the help of the military but by themselves. This is an example for you, and an answer to the question of who will buy?

We have now approached the forms: There is credit, leasing, and leasehold [kredit, lizing, arenda]. Let us choose the most suitable for us. And we will act. Private stores will appear; competition and goods will appear too. This is how people throughout the world have achieved the fact that something is there. The same can be done with laundries, hairdressing salons, dry cleaning centers, various workshops, etc. There is of course the problem of large enterprises, but all over the world they are never sold to anyone. Society does not permit this because it is called monopolism, and superincomes and furious stratification emerge. The latter, incidentally, resembles what is to be observed in our country today. Therefore the question is decided by means of shares, and this security can even have a value of R5. For some reason everyone thinks that the nominal cost of shares must be hundreds of thousands of rubles. Not at all!

[Garifullina] Whom would you define as the holder of a controlling package of shares?

[Yavlinskiy] If we succeed in making a sensible antimonopoly law together with the law on privatization, then this question too will fall away. That is, society itself can decide to whom it will entrust this package in principle. It even has the right to decide to no one. For example, in Japan the minimum cost of shares which participate in exchange operations is such that anyone at all can buy them. Of course he cannot buy a lot, but a certain number yes. Incidentally, their fair deals committee monitors the process, and when somebody buys too many shares it at once ascertains what is going on and why a lot of shares are being bought. The case can even go to court.

We too are already creating such structures in a rudimentary form. We have an antimonopoly committee and a committee for the management of state property. But in addition to all these things, I believe that the process must proceed with the maximum glasnost and under the maximum control of society, in the forms which society itself will elaborate. I proceed from a simple premise: People have made everything that we have in our country and republic, and since we have seen for ourselves that ownership in the form in which it exists is inefficient and does not give the right return, we must find other forms. The question is only that it is necessary to take a very attentive and thorough attitude to this process. What inspires hope? The fact that the problem will be resolved not by one person, not by Sidorov or Petrov, but by deputies. The question will be discussed, and so it seems to me that the problem is soluble.

[Garifullina] But I believe that it is possible to understand in a human way the concern and the misgivings which are being expressed today in connection with privatization.

[Yavlinskiy] The misgivings are not only human, they are professional too. Of course there are grounds for them.

[Garifullina] It is evidently no coincidence that your program devotes a large section to the shadow economy. What is its potential? What is your assessment of the real danger that the shadow economy poses to our society and state and to the future of the market?

[Yavlinskiy] Well let us turn to the program. It defines the shadow economy as the production, distribution, exchange, and consumption of commodity-material assets and services not controlled by society, i.e. socioeconomic relations among individual citizens and social groups concealed from organs of state management and the public concerning the use of state property in mercenary personal or group interests.

Let us see how certain phenomena of the shadow economy are assessed.

The fictitious economy. According to data of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee], repeat accounting amounts to 36-40 percent of the value of the social product, i.e. of the order of R600 billion in 1989.

Nonproductive expenditure and losses, according to data of the USSR Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics], amounted to approximately R40 billion in 1988.

In the estimation of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] All-Union Scientific Research Institute, production of substandard output reaches R110 billion and figure padding amounts to R15-30 billion. Law-enforcement organs bring to light 240,000-280,000 mercenary crimes in the economy every year, the damage totals R200-255 million, and 250,000-300,000 people are involved in committing these crimes. At the same time between seven and 12 percent of the total number of crimes are committed by groups of people. The tendency for general crime and economic crime to merge and its intersectoral and interregional nature are clearly recorded.

Assessments of other phenomena of the shadow economy: artificial shortages—R40 billion (All-Union Scientific Research Institute for the Study of Public Demand for Consumer Goods and the Trade Situation); concealment of goods from open sale—R6 billion (USSR MVD All-Union Scientific Research Institute); defrauding of customers—R10.7 billion (USSR Goskomstat), R4.4-9.8 billion (USSR MVD All-Union Scientific Research Institute), and in the services sphere as a whole—R14-16 billion (USSR Gosplan Scientific Research Economics Institute); illegal price rises—R1.2-1.5 billion (USSR State Prices Committee); speculation in motor vehicles—R5.7 billion, and in spare parts for car servicing—R1.0 billion; income from speculation in nonfood goods—R1.3 billion, and in alcoholic beverages—R0.1 billion (USSR Goskomstat); prostitution—R0.7 billion; and the narcotics business—R0.3 billion (USSR Goskomstat); etc.

Such is the range. But we have specially included assessments which strike us as unrealistic: i.e. unrealistically small and unrealistically large.

In our opinion, the chief reason for the existence of the shadow economy in our country on such a scale is the absence of private ownership of the means of production and the continued predominance of administrative edict methods of managing the activities of economic subjects. Of course there are other factors too. We consider it necessary to provide these assessments and to draw up a number of recommendations: what to do with the shadow economy and how to combat it. We are convinced that the shadow economy must settle accounts with society. True I have a poor idea of whether it is possible to instigate a witch-hunt now. Since there is money, people in the shadow economy will quickly buy those who do the catching. It may be possible to find two dozen very honest people, but two dozen will not be enough and it will all go round again. Have we tried to fight? Yes we have. We tried under Andropov and before him too. It cannot be said that no one has ever tried to do anything. We have tried. We have adopted decisions and involved people and the laws. Whatever we have done, nothing has worked out. Is that obvious? It is obvious.

[Garifullina] Where is the way out?

[Yavlinskiy] I have already said: It is necessary to make the shadow economy pay society and work for it. Let it be of benefit. But it seems to me that it must not be legalized just like that. It is necessary to use procedures so as to **make** it give back to society what it has accumulated in iniquitous ways, let us put it like this. And incidentally, when privatization is carried out I absolutely do not rule out that declarations of incomes must be reflected in this law.

[Garifullina] As a means of combating the shadow economy many scientists and publicists propose implementing a monetary reform.

[Yavlinskiy] I regard monetary reform as an absolutely extreme measure—God forbid that we come to it—but it could be used if all efforts have been exhausted. Why? I will explain. Monetary reform is a measure on a colossal scale, very costly and lengthy. And there are two sides to every coin. Imagine a miner or someone working beyond the Arctic Circle who has saved all his life to buy himself a house. You have to construct very diverse methods and forms in order not to deprive him of the fruits of his life's labor. If you have managed to buy a little house, then under monetary reform you become a very rich person. But if you have only saved money and then lost it, you end up a pauper.

[Garifullina] It would probably be possible to think up some mechanism or define some threshold—which incidentally is also proposed.

[Yavlinskiy] But tell me, if we are going to speak about a threshold, do you believe in the fundamental difference between three stolen rubles and ten? Why was it possible to steal R20,000 but not R25,000?

[Garifullina] But it would evidently be a question of earned incomes and of measures to protect that miner.

[Yavlinskiy] What? Do you want to set a limit for the miner? Or for everyone?

[Garifullina] For everyone.

[Yavlinskiy] Then solve this problem: I have managed to steal R25,000. You have stolen R35,000. They will take R10,000 from you and leave me with the whole R25,000. Why? You will say: It is necessary to produce documents and explanations. We have thought about this too, but believe me, this is a very painful and very serious measure and only a totally superficial look lets you think that monetary reform establishes justice. It really can remove some injustices, but it could at once give rise to some new ones. I do not know how many people in the shadow economy will be punished, but it seems to me that very many people will suffer who have happened to fall "under the chariot," as the saying goes.

Then you know, there is a lot of currency about. We will exchange money for everything, and guys with currency will simply be kings. But we will not reach agreement with Bush to exchange dollars too. This means that after the reform some people will have kopeks and some will have dollars. Girls who work outside hotels, for example, they will get the better of us all. What workers in the shadow economy! They have dollars! They do not give a damn for all our monetary reforms.

[Garifullina] Grigoriy Alekseyevich, the practice of East European countries which have already entered a market economy attests that the poor get still poorer and the rich richer. The colossal growth in prices, inflation, and unemployment hit precisely the poor and, as SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA wrote recently, "the umbrella of social protection for the indigent" cannot, alas, lighten their lot. What social guarantees does your program give us? What measures of social protection does it provide for?

[Yavlinskiy] We believe that conditions will be created even during the transitional period first to stabilize and then to raise living standards. Our concept is to eliminate the working person's estrangement from the means of production, include people in the process of transformations in the economy, and grant them freedom of economic activity and enterprise and thus freedom to shape their well-being and prosperity.

As for measures of social protection.... Well, first there are current measures—income indexation, let us say, if prices rise.

The second aspect is the minimum budget. How much talk there has been about it! Well tell me, has someone now assumed responsibility for the minimum budget? What size is it? No one wants to speak about this. However, on what is the whole system of pensions, allowances, grants, and also wages to be built? Any schoolchild knows this: on the minimum budget. But no one wants to set it. Why? Because they are choosing between two evils. If it is named, everyone will at once shout out: Now emulate the minimum wage if you please, emulate this level. But since it is fantastically high now because of shortages, because of prices, because of speculators, no one can set such a minimum wage.

We believe that the minimum budget must be named, and we will do so before the end of the year; then we will build on its basis the whole system of labor remuneration, pensions, grants, and allowances. But the situation now is such that there is nothing with which to do this. That is, we can give money, but there is nothing to buy. In short, we believe that the whole system of social guarantees must be built on real things, must be ramified enough, and must affect everyone. The social orientation of the system which we propose is that people acquire freedom of economic activity, independence, property, and access to the means of production; and with time they will acquire the right also to set the price, but of course within the limits of what the consumer will agree to.

And so society grants you freedom of economic activity. The reverse of this freedom is your personal responsibility for the family, the collective, and society.

But we also have another category of people—and it is quite large—which will be unable to get used to the new conditions for objective reasons. These are invalids, the sick, and pensioners. It is my conviction that the state must help mainly these people. Those in the former must cope with their problems themselves. Then it will be good for the latter since the state will be able to give them really strong help. And then our enterprising guys will be real men, not those who only go about begging: "Give me an apartment and a travel warrant, please give me a plot of land. I entreat you, do not refuse." All must put an end to this. If you have earned then go and buy yourself an apartment, a dacha, a plot. You must know that if you work better your family lives better too. But the situation now is such that, even if you were to die beside your machine tool, they would not give you more than R350.

It seems to me that we should not take such a narrow approach to the question of social protection measures as though there should be some state assistance or subsidies, but take a broad approach: The state has protected me by giving me the opportunity to earn myself. That is genuine social protection. And if I were to fall ill, or God forbid something were to happen to me, the state would not forget about me. In the first instance it does not touch me and protects my interests, passively so to speak. And in the second instance it actively helps me.

When the trade unions have strengthened and become a third force, then all three will give society the opportunity to develop as a healthy organism.

[Garifullina] The two other forces—are they the state and the producers?

[Yavlinskiy] Yes, and these three forces have different interests, but they will lead society forward only together, having united. I have in mind only economic forces, leaving all political forces to one side.

[Garifullina] Grigoriy Alekseyevich, very many people are interested in foreign investments in our national economy. Well now I no longer know—is it national or not?

[Yavlinskiy] National, national! Incidentally, it will become precisely national. We have a state economy now, but it will be a national economy.

[Garifullina] OK, let us not argue about terms. We will interpret them. However, to what extent will the participation of foreign capital in our economy be permitted?

[Yavlinskiy] I advocate a very cautious approach. I believe that first, there must be a law on foreign investments in the republic in which everything must be taken into account, just as in the law on privatization: our present generation, people's thoughts in this regard, and their attitude to the question. The opinion exists that we must not sell off. I have a deferential attitude toward it, believing that there are serious arguments and fears behind it and not at all simply criticism for criticism's sake. Therefore I believe that everything must be reflected in the law. There are a number of fundamental decisions—on privatization, on land, on foreign investments—and these are the laws to whose preparation special attention must be paid. I personally will champion this position: At the first stage there must be serious elements of protectionism, i.e. there can and must be participation by foreign capital, but within limits that do not affect national interests. There must be a definite limit. There can be no question of selling off everything to foreigners. Why then do we make our own currency?

There are other questions of foreign technologies, service. This is very important. We also need patterns. And as regards large investments and large purchases, we must be very cautious and thorough here. It is no secret that during privatization the price of our enterprises and of the fixed capital at our disposal must be set primarily for our citizens and not for foreigners, and in general I am convinced that we should not be in such a tearing hurry to involve them. Incidentally, they are not in a tearing hurry now either because they do not understand what is happening here....

[Garifullina] ...And whether it is worth investing money.

[Yavlinskiy] Of course, it is not known how everything will turn out here, what will happen. Therefore my aims as regards this question are as follows. To ensure that blood runs in veins and that there is competition and rivalry, in this sense foreigners must be admitted. There can be diverse, mixed forms of their involvement, and the degree of admission can also vary: less at first, a bit more at a certain moment. But foreigners must have guarantees. That is, we will determine the extent of their involvement, but they must have an absolute guarantee within the limits of that extent. In this sense Russia must become a country where no one must be afraid of doing anything, otherwise... otherwise nothing will happen.

[Garifullina] One more question: the fate of the Union and your program. Will it promote integration and consolidation?

[Yavlinskiy] Well, judge for yourself. If during the process of preparing the program and after the strong centrifugal situations which have shaken the country, the republics sat with us for weeks at the level of government representatives and we at last agreed with them on the main points of this program, and if they discussed in the Presidential Council and at all other conferences on which terms we must cooperate, this you will agree is reassuring. This is a weighty argument in favor of our being able to make consistent progress. When we have created a normal economy, one which unites us all, then talk of a political union will evolve differently here. Through economic union we will move toward political union and the Union treaty.

[Garifullina] When will the 500 days start being counted off?

[Yavlinskiy] As soon as parliament adopts the basic laws and gives the program a juridical basis.

[Garifullina] Grigoriy Alekseyevich, at all public defenses of the program you have said that you are not sure whether it will be adopted but that you deem it an honor to present it to society. And now Russia's parliament has approved it. Are you happy?

[Yavlinskiy] No. I am very, very concerned. I was happy for a few minutes, but now I am thinking about how to do things the right way for the people. This is how I feel.... I do not know which word describes it....

Supreme Soviet Examines Program

LD0110105590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Report by correspondent Lyudmila Semina from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet]

[Excerpt] This morning here there was a meeting of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium chaired by First Deputy Chairman Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov. They discussed the readiness of the draft laws for implementation of the 500 days program. From tomorrow a joint session of the chambers is to work on the immediate draft laws and decisions—on a Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic referendum, local referendum, pension provision in the Russian Federation, the establishment of a Russian pension fund, and the creation of a nutrition industry in the Russian Federation. These are all vitally important issues for the people of Russia.

Also today Soviet of Nationalities Chairman Ramazan Khadzhimuratovich Abduratipov convened a meeting of his chamber. He reported on progress in drafting the federative treaty. To judge by the situation in the republic, this draft ought to be adopted as soon as possible. One gains the impression that there is a tacit competition to see who can go furthest with sovereignty, it was stated today, and no one is working out whether a declaration of sovereignty is advantageous or not. The autonomous entities are proceeding from adverse historical experience because in effect our state has been a unitarian one and we have never really had any experience of a federation as yet.

Several draft variants of the federative treaty have been prepared. There has been a conference of representatives from the autonomous entities and nationalities with no national-territorial formation whose proposals are also being taken into account. The chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities was asked numerous questions which really grappled hard with the problem. [passage omitted]

Silayev Interviewed on Program

LD0110214990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Interview with Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic prime minister, by correspondent Oleg Bobin; date and place not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Silayev] Indeed, we were ready to put this program into action as of 1 October. Let me remind you that in the text of the program, the first day starts from the issue of the president's decree and correspondingly, the decrees of the Supreme Soviets of the Union republics on putting the program into action. But subsequent events which were chiefly related to the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet and discussion of the programs have resulted in there being no USSR Supreme Soviet position today, neither with regard to the Shatalin-Yavlinskiy program nor to the program reportd by the president—which is also called the Aganbegyan program. Now a third program, the government program, has appeared.

You know that the deadline either for the choice of a program or for the formation of an optimal program, and this means optimizing the program on the basis of the three presented, was set for 15 October. Consequently, the process of making the start of the 500 days program official has been postponed by a decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

We impatiently await this date, 15 October, when it is our view—I would even say our conviction—that the program will nevertheless be adopted on the basis of a decision by Gorbachev and Yeltsin, the presidential program. We are not wasting time now and we are working on submitting the main draft laws that are essential for the first 100 days.

You will recall that the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet instructed the Russian Government to present a plan for the implementation of the program within a month. This period runs out for us on 12 October, but we will submit the implementation plan to the Supreme Soviet a few days before this. In other words, we are conducting work enabling the start of the transition. Now, bearing in mind the deadline of 15 October as determined by the USSR Supreme Soviet, it remains for us to establish the operation and start of the program as of 1 November.

[Bobin] The USSR Supreme Soviet is finding it very difficult to adopt this document. It is constantly searching for a compromise solution of some kind. Is it possible that a program will be proposed that will also force you to search for compromises?

[Silayev] Well, first and foremost we are always ready to use interesting solutions and proposals that will reinforce our program. We are against distorting the fundamental approach of the radical switch to a market that is set forth in our program.

For this reason, we are ready for a constructive search for some kind of improvements, some kind of perfections that will ultimately make this program better. We are ready for this.

RSFSR Official Interviewed on Union Treaty

LD0110211490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1451 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Excerpts] Today the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium assembled to finalize the agenda and the order of work. There was a sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities. This is what Ramazan Abdulatipov, the chairman of this chamber, reported in an interview with our correspondent Ludmila Semina:

[Begin recording] [passage omitted] [Semina] Today there was a sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities concerning an extremely important issue. Could you please tell us about this?

[Abdulatipov] I decided to inform the Soviet of Nationalities about the progress of work on the Federation Treaty. We already have several variants worked out and very many proposals and we now want to put several variants to the republic's Supreme Soviet and to the oblasts and krays of the Russian Federation to work out some views in common on concluding a federation treaty.

[Semina] How do you feel about the fact that on the territory of the Russian Federation one autonomous republic after another is declaring its sovereignty?

[Abdulatipov] This is the year of sovereignties. Sovereignty is being declared at every level, it is probably clear, starting from the national territorial level right down to individuals. All of these levels were under, or within the framework of, some sort of totalitarian system when neither a person nor a nation had the chance to talk about themselves, declare themselves an independent subject of the state. This fully justifies this declaration of soveriegnty. Sometimes we are reproached for not regularizing these issues, these processes. We consider... we bear in mind the experience of the Union state—the USSR Supreme Soviet—which began to regularize this process very harshly and in actual fact, to an even greater extent worsened things and increased the opposition of the republics to the center, and of the various republics to each other, of the population within the republics, native and nonnative. To avoid such processes we decided, and this is the attitude of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, that they should at this stage define themselves as they want to, each republic, each territorial formation, and then in the process of concluding the federation treaty it is obvious that at some time or another they will be taken into account by the republics themselves and by the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet so that we can reach the formation of a sort of Russian home.

[Semina] Many of our autonomous entities, in declaring sovereignty, do not even take into account all the economic consequences, do not take into account that this is a far more serious matter not to be done in a rush.

[Abdulatipov] At the moment there are to a large extent, let us say, purely political declarations. Even many specialists who work on these documents in fact now turn out not to know this entire mechanism, they do not know and they cannot envision the consequences, the socioeconomic consequences of these declarations. Furthermore, I would here like to add one more point. In accordance with the existing constitution, the status of national states and autonomous entities and other entities that lie in the Russian Federation is, in the final analysis, guaranteed by the Russian Federation. The following point is very important if we are talking abut the signing of the Union treaty: it is inconceivable that we should speak against the participation of republics, including autonomous republics and even autonomous entities in the Union treaty; it is their business, let them participate, but obviously as the Russian Federation as a federal entity will also participate in the signing of the Union treaty, we must determine our position on our federal set-up as quickly as possible.

[Semina] Ramazan Khadzhimuratovich, my last question, a very short one which is worrying all our listeners: where is Boris Nikolayevich? We were expecting him today; the telephones simply will not stop, so I must ask you.

[Abdulatipov] I can tell you as a former doctor that in this given case, as far as possible and if only for a little while, it is necessary to rest up. But Boris Nikolayevich has already been at work. Our comrades know that even now he is actively participating in work on certain questions. Boris Nikolayevich is a strong person, both physically and spiritually, therefore this is all; obviously his normal state will return, at the same time I would like to thank again those listeners who are phoning you....

[Semina] Those Russians....

[Abdulatipov] Those Russians who send us telegrams, who worry. This once more speaks of our great accountability, the accountability of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet and the leadership of the Supreme Soviet and that high level of trust which they, first and foremost, give to both Boris Nikolayevich as an individual and to the Supreme Soviet and we will try to justify this trust and these hopes of our Russians. [end recording]

Khasbulatov Urges Unity

*PM0110140190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
25 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2*

[Article by R. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet: "Russia Can and Must Be Reborn Under the Flag of Unity"—first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] The separatist trends and hasty steps leading to the split of the Union that have been taken in a number of republics cannot fail to cause alarm. However, many people are convinced that secession from the USSR will help to solve their regional problems. Not just republics but sometimes even certain regions are staking a claim to absolute sovereignty and independence from the center, declaring everything on their territory to be their property. However, the hope that it may be possible to turn the pyramid of power upside down and build it from the bottom up is hardly justified. Nowhere in the world have states ever been based on this principle. Nowhere has it ever been proclaimed that local administrative organs can appropriate as much power as they like and pass on to superior bodies only as much as they deem necessary.

IZVESTIYA drew attention to the danger of separatist aspirations in the articles "Russians Leaving Russia!" by A. Tsipko (No. 147); "Industructible Union!" by A. Migranyan (No. 264); and a number of other articles. It is a hopeful sign that a mature view of the prospects for our statehood is emerging and that there is an understanding of the healthy and necessary order of things. We hope that readers will see this for themselves when they read the article we publish today by R. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet:

What is now happening to the country is nothing other than a single universal crisis affecting the entire political and economic system of the USSR. And we are facing a combination of economic and constitutional crises. They are "feeding" off each other, expanding their spheres of influence, and affecting the life of society and each of us ever more deeply.

The situation in the RSFSR is getting complex. Alongside typical economic, social, and ecological problems the crisis in the state-administrative and national-territorial makeup is most acutely visible here. It is placing the most important principle—that of the RSFSR's independence as a united sovereign country and a state making up the USSR along with the other Union states—in real jeopardy.

The specific feature that distinguishes the RSFSR from the other 14 Union states is that Russia cannot even theoretically raise the question of "secession from the USSR." There is nowhere to secede from! The USSR was fatefully created by other republics—some of which were independent states—joining the RSFSR. That is why real secession from the USSR for many Union states actually amounts to a gradual weakening of economic and political ties with the RSFSR, although outwardly this can be seen as a weakening of ties with the so-called center. After all, the Baltic countries for instance are closing or trying to close their borders with the RSFSR—they have no borders with the center. Or they are demanding that troops be withdrawn to Russia rather than to a putative center.

That is, from the Union republics' standpoint Russia is the center and vice versa; hence the inevitable intensification of another trend engendered by the weakening of the center's positions in the republics—the Union authorities are stepping up the pressure on the RSFSR and the Russian leadership. This is reflected at many levels of authority in the RSFSR. Particularly destructive work against Russian unity is being conducted by the colossal numbers of "mid-level bureaucrats." These are members of party committees in Russia, ministerial civil servants, and part of the numerous structures at different types of concerns, associations, and various sectorial amalgamations. The idea of "separating" certain regions from Russia on ethnic or territorial grounds is being actively championed.

There have been serious attempts to destroy regional ties within Russia itself, which creates additional difficulties for the new Russian authorities in implementing the program of transition to the market, above all its first stages: stabilizing the situation through strengthening the financial position and overcoming the shortages of consumer goods. And the center claims that the crisis—in which the country finds itself thanks to the Union government—is not the result of its own actions over the past five years but has allegedly been caused by the Russian authorities themselves. This was stated in N.I. Ryzhkov's televised speech 15 September this year.

We will undoubtedly solve our economic problems through the expedited development of market structures with the support of our fellow citizens. This I believe. But I am worried and considerably alarmed about the problem of Russia's state makeup, including its national and territorial aspect.

Today almost all of Russia's 16 autonomous republics have adopted or are preparing to adopt declarations stating themselves to be "sovereign." On the spur of the moment many have hastily dropped the word "autonomous" from their names. Incidentally there is an understanding among the RSFSR Supreme Soviet leadership of the need to avoid this adjective—which would certainly be done in the process of the elaboration of a new federal treaty, versions of which already exist at the Constitutional Commission, the Chamber of Nationalities, the Soviet of the Republic, and RSFSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions.

Unfortunately, the content of the declarations adopted by Russia's autonomous entities attest to the considerable confusion in the minds of their compilers about concepts such as "the state," "sovereignty," "autonomy," "self-administration," and "the free expression of the people's will." This will force the representatives of autonomous authorities to resort in discussions with their opponents to such arguments as: "Look, you have declared your sovereignty in Russia, we too want sovereignty for ourselves." And even my old acquaintance V. Fedorov, having become an oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] chairman, has decided—judging by documents given to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet—to declare Sakhalin a "sovereign republic." How else can we assess the intention to proclaim the continental shelf "Sakhalin's property"? Here we can see in the clearest possible form that different level problems—above all, interstate and intrastate relations—are being mixed up.

Interstate relations exist, first between the 15 Union republics as the sole founders of the USSR, and second between the Union republics, the founders of the Union, and the Union center. The Union center is a product of the first Union treaty, an agreement between the Union states themselves—the sole founders of the Union. And if the Union center has gradually become a self-sufficient force which has escaped from the control of its founders—the only components of the Union—this does not mean that they are entitled to tolerate this degrading position. Incidentally, certain representatives of the Union states' authorities may perhaps have come to terms with their status, but their peoples are demanding that the broken law be restored and at least brought into line with the existing Constitution. Even under the Constitution Union republics are sovereign, independent states with corresponding constitutional rights in implementing their sovereignty. And by dint of this, their declarations on state sovereignty are based on a right enshrined in the Constitution and make them (legally speaking) independent of the Union center.

That is why the main "Union center-Union republics" interstate problem is not to ensure that the center "recognizes" or "fails to recognize" a certain Union republic's independence. The issue is in a different political area—namely the problem of accurately defining the system of relations between economies, that is in the economic sphere. And this sphere is subject to the processes of production sharing between republics and the division of labor. It does not need to be administered by directive.

The second problem is intrastate relations, that is relations within the RSFSR and the components of the single Russian state: the oblasts, krays, and national formations. This problem should be defined "vertically" and "horizontally." "Vertically" it means relations between the oblasts, krays, and autonomous entities and the Russian state as a single and indivisible unit from the standpoint of the division of powers, relations between the "whole" and the components of this "whole". Second, it means relations between autonomous entities on the one hand, and oblasts and krays on the other hand from the standpoint of the comparability of their powers "horizontally".

Today's interpretation of sovereignty by certain national republics in Russia goes far beyond the framework of their actual, not to mention their legal status as indissoluble parts of a single state. Nobody denies the actual frustration experienced by the autonomous entities nor the ignoring of the interests of national revival on the part of the traditional center of power. But nonetheless their claims to the status of founders of a so-called "renewed Union" are quite absurd. Why?

Because they are part of the single Russian state. And consequently, all problems should be submitted at the level of that state as has been the accepted state practice for centuries.

Moreover, it was not the autonomous entities which founded the USSR but the 15 Union republics on the principle of "one republic, one vote." This principle was formulated in practice by Lenin in his criticism of Stalin's concept of the "autonomization" of the Union republics. Autonomous entities are not states but administrative-state formations. They are state systems and administrative-state formations based on the historic homelands of different peoples. Thus their sovereignty is limited. But the oblasts and krays of Russia are now raising their voices with quite justified demands that their rights be placed on a par with the rights of autonomous entities and that they be allowed to become the founders of a "renewed Union."

In this case the question arises: What do they want to turn Russia into? Who is undermining the principle recognized around the world that a state is indivisible unless its people freely express their will to the contrary? Is it not a question of attempts to "Balkanize" Russia and break up a state with a glorious 1,000-year history and a culture that is irreplaceable in world civilization? The talks between the center and the autonomous entities of the RSFSR cannot be called anything other than separation [separatnyy] talks in these circumstances, all the more so when the leadership of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has clearly set out its programmatic provisions as regards really enhancing the status of Russia's national formations. In particular, B. Yeltsin has set out an essentially universal concept for building new power structures "from the bottom up" whereby each level has the powers which it is capable of wielding effectively and in the interests of its population. And it transfers to the "top" level those powers which are of general state interest. Only this approach can essentially streamline all the socioeconomic and political relations in the RSFSR and give extensive powers to the autonomous entities, oblasts, and krays.

Nonetheless, if attempts are made to dismember Russia by removing certain republics from it, everyone should be guided by the norms commonly accepted in world practice. In particular, this will require a referendum not only in each individual republic but throughout Russia. Russians and Russians alone should determine whether they want to keep Russia as a unified and indivisible, democratic, flourishing state or whether they want to turn it into splintered semifeudal principalities rent by contradictions and squabbles.

These initial positions in resolving these issues are particularly important for us now, in the immediate run-up to Union and federal treaties. And all the more so at a time when we are rapidly approaching the implementation of the most important economic reforms in our 70-year history. After all, we now need to be more united than ever and to pool all the national, patriotic, democratic, cultural, and religious forces of Russia's peoples. This alone can finally save an impoverished and desperate people. I call on my fellow citizens to recognize the majesty of unity in a united Russian state and to support our efforts to create a great country in which all peoples will have their own flourishing homelands.

Moscow's Socioeconomic Situation Called Explosive

PM0110145990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Sep 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by TASS correspondent B. Shestakov: "Moscow: An Explosive Situation"]

[Text] The critical tension in the capital which is acquiring an explosive character is causing serious concern to the Moscow CPSU Gorkom [City Party Committee]. In its opinion this has been caused by the unsatisfactory resolution of vitally important socioeconomic questions.

Having discussed the situation in the capital 26 September, the Moscow Gorkom [city party committee] Bureau established as facts, in particular, the continuing fall in social production, an increase in the imbalance in goods-money relations, and the destruction of economic links. The rate of increase of consumer goods output is three times less than the increase in the population's incomes. Production of the most important goods is being cut. Sizable food stocks have failed to be delivered to the city, and an extraordinary situation is developing regarding the provision of fruit and vegetables to Muscovites. As a result of a fall in construction work, the city's inhabitants as the saying goes here "are short of" over 25,000 apartments; around 50 schools and preschool establishments; 20 health service facilities; and a considerable number of trade, public catering, and service sector enterprises. Transport, housing and utilities, and power enterprises' work to ensure the city's vital activities in winter gives great cause for alarm.

All this engenders a lack of confidence in tomorrow, causes an increase in crime and various offenses, and undermines the force of authority. Together with that, individual decisions of Moscow City Soviet and its ispolkom [executive committee] are of a general, declarative nature; are not based on a profound analysis of the situation; and do not always take account of the opinion of various strata of the population. Having rejected the old approaches, many leaders are just not trying to devise new economic levers which is leading to failures in branches of the city's economy. The lack of a clear differentiation of powers between city and rayon organs and soviet and economic organs, and between soviets and their ispolkoms has had an adverse effect. Party committees have so far not found new forms of exerting political influence on processes and are displaying unfounded passivity.

The discussion showed that in the new situation certain leaders have ended up with virtually no checks upon them. The party has already moved away from functions that are not inherently its functions, but the soviets are so far not assuming the burden of responsibility for the city's position.

We have gathered here, stressed Yu.A. Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee, not to accuse somebody but to find a way out of the critical situation together. The city party committee bureau urges the capital's Communists to do everything possible to stabilize the situation and solve the most important questions regarding Moscow's vital activities. "Today that is the paramount political task of the city party organization," the secretary stressed.

The bureau supported the initiative of the city's primary organizations and Communists that every CPSU member should work not less than three days in the fields around Moscow.

RSFSR Party Sensitive to Servicemen's Problems

PM0210085190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Using Man as the Yardstick"]

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Control Commission has held an organizational plenum. The areas of work discussed at it included questions relating to the social protection of military servicemen. Colonel N.S. Stolyarov, chairman of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission, told TASS correspondent S. Ostanin about it.

"The position of Russia's Communists on the USSR Armed Forces was expressed with the utmost clarity by the RSFSR Communist Party Constituent Congress: It is to help implement the military reform and work to strengthen ties and trust between the Army and society. It is our conviction that the law, the state, and local organs of power must ensure social protection for military servicemen and prevent any attempts to defame or impugn the dignity and honor of the Armed Forces.

"Army problems are treated the same as the rest in the Central Control Commission's activity. They are given the importance that they deserve. Indeed, should a rigid dividing line be drawn at our level between people in military uniform and civilians? That is why our structure does not include a special subsection to examine complaints or statement from military servicemen. The Central Control Commission is now setting up organizations: commissions and groups. Naturally we will not ignore any appeal to us from the military. This idea of sensitivity to the needs of communist military servicemen was voiced at the Central Control Commission's organizational plenum.

"Protecting the rights, honor, and dignity of Communists—the problem of military servicemen's social protection is an aspect of that in our daily activity. In the short period that I have been in office I have received quite a few letters from military servicemen, some containing requests for help. For example, a recent student of mine and a graduate of the Yu.A. Gagarin Air Force Academy wrote and asked me to restore his good name. In his opinion, the law has done him an injustice. You might think that he had written to the wrong man. But this is a party comrade addressing us. He needs help. Of course, it is easier to forward the letter to the relevant authorities—and have done with the matter. But I think that such a work style is unacceptable to us. We must think how to help people.

"Of course, it is difficult for us to respond promptly to all Communists' requests and comments given the limited composition of the Central Control Commission provided by the organization structure. But we are hoping for help from volunteers. It is pleasing that our mailbag does not just contain complaints, statements, and requests. Very often there are offers of help to the Central Control Commission and me personally in this difficult undertaking.

"I believe that we will be able to win back the people's trust. Faith in working people gives us strength. I believe that we will eventually reform our society's political system, revive our lost spiritual values, and transform economic life in such a way that man really does become the measure of all things. Our ideal is a humanist, democratic society which judges all its plans, programs, and projects using man as the yardstick. There can be no alternative."

RSFSR Harvest Workers To Receive Benefits

LD0110210590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers has adopted a decision on additional benefits for those involved in harvesting. It envisages the exemption from income tax deducted from the wages of employees of enterprises and organizations, students, pupils, and servicemen who were involved in harvesting from 1 September to 31 October this year.

RSFSR Broadcasting Plans Outlined

LD0110212490 Moscow GOVORIT I POKAZYAVET MOSKVA in Russian 1 Oct 90 p19

[Unattributed article: "Once more on the subject of state television and radio broadcasting for the Russian Federation"]

[Excerpts] A regular edition of the television program "Here in Ostankino" took place on 20 July of this year. Taking part in it were leading staff of the USSR Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting]. Under discussion was the present state of television and the prospects for its development in the immediate and distant future. The program was broadcast live, and it provoked enormous interest among viewers. But it lasted for just one hour. Naturally many of the questions that were asked were left unanswered. A lot of questions were received after the program ended, both by those taking part in it and by this weekly newspaper. Our correspondent Vyacheslav Yanchevskiy has had another meeting with Valentin Ivanovich Khlebnikov, head of the main scientific and technical and production directorate of the USSR state committee for television and radio broadcasting, who was one of those who took part in the program. [passage omitted]

[Reporter] And Comrade Kazmin from Ulyanovsk writes: "Surely the Russian Federation has made some investment in the technical base of Central Television?" The same question is asked by Comrade Kristal from Moscow.

[Khlebnikov] The Russian Federation certainly has made a considerable share of the investment in the development of the television and radio system both in Moscow and in the localities, in the kray, oblast, and republican centers of the federation. Suffice it to remember that 70 of the 120 television centers that exist in the country operate upon the territory of the federation. And all of them belong to the Russian Federation. No one is encroaching upon them. Does Russia have a share in Central Television? Of course it does! [passage omitted]

Nor is there any foundation for the reproach that the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting in some way wants to drag out resolving the issue of setting up television and radio for Russia. We are actively promoting their establishment as quickly as possible. [passage omitted]

This decree places an obligation upon the RSFSR Council of Ministers to allocate resources for running the state television and radio of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. We are participating in work on implementing this decision in the most direct way possible. Meetings have taken place with M.N. Poltoranin, chairman of the committee on mass information media, and with leaders of the television and radio broadcasting of the RSFSR. It is intended that Russian Federation radio broadcasting will start at the beginning of November. For this the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting is allocating several hours of broadcasting time within the first, second, and third programs of all-Union radio. Then over the course of the following year we have agreed to engage jointly in setting up a separate network of channels and transmitters for relaying Russian Federation programs. There is a similar picture with regard to RSFSR television, too. It is a question of making available to start with a certain quantity of hours of screen time within the first and second all-union programs of central television. [passage omitted]

Summing up what has been said, I would like to stress once again that the plan for development of multiprogram broadcasting which has been worked out and which is already being implemented by USSR Gosteleradio jointly with the USSR Ministry of Communications and the comunications equipment industry resolves many acute problems in the best possible way and ensures the formation of a system of state television and radio broadcasting for the RSFSR and the provision of a large number of broadcasting channels for the country's television viewers and radio listeners.

Four all-Union television channels are envisaged at the first stage: the present first and second channels; a third channel which will be educational; and a channel which will be made available in full for the transmission of the programs of Russian Federation television. The solution of this task will be assisted by satellite television and the system which is currently being actively developed under the name "Gelikon".

We expect that industry will manufacture and ensure the launching of the first satellite in 1991. It will operate in the European zone of the Soviet Union. The new programs, including those of the Russian Federation, will be relayed by it. According to our calculations—and they are being coordinated with the plans of industry—the "Gelikon" system will be formed over the whole of the country's territory by the year 1995. We hope to begin test transmissions by satellite from next year and to build up the number of satellites, receiving stations, and cable distribution network transmitting stations over a period of five years.

NOVYY MIR Registered in RSFSR

LD0110225790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Oct 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The journal NOVYY MIR has been registered at the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of the Press and Mass Media. Its founders are the editorial work collective, the Literary Foundation of the USSR Union of Writers, and the Tsentr-Novyy Mir publishing cooperative.

'Plethora' of New Publications Noted in Leningrad

LD0110141390 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT 1 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Serdobolskiy]

[Text] Leningrad October 1 TASS—Glasnost has spawned a plethora of new publications as any glance at one of the many kiosks in Leningrad will confirm.

Gone are the items when most newspapers in the USSR were published under the motto "Workers of the world unite". The independent newspaper "COMMENTATOR" opens with the following words: "We know how to overcome the crisis, and we cannot be silent." The Organ of Evangelical Christian-Baptists' THE PROTESTANT appears under the motto: "Where there is God's spirit, there is freedom."

Vendors sell the newspapers CIVIC DIGNITY, PRAYERS, NON-FORMAL, CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY, FREE WORD, RUSSIA'S REVIVAL... but they do not sell well: They are quite expensive and do not carry the latest news.

The Lenin Museum has launched its own publication SOVEST (CONSCIENCE) to protect the founder of the Socialist state against ever more frequent attacks.

Most in demand is the DIGEST 24 HOURS. It carries the gist of the most interesting reports from hundreds of Soviet and foreign publications. The newspaper is issued by the Leningrad Union of Journalists.

New Newspaper Published in Omsk

LD0110210290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Summary] The first trial issue of NARODNAYA GAZETA was published by the Omsk oblast soviet of people's deputies. It contains information on programs of candidates for the post of editor-in-chief and voters' remarks on the work of soviets, on problems of Siberian Germans, on prospects for farm holdings, and cable television.

Military Stops Journalists Visiting Novaya Zemlya

PM0210095790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Filippov: "Old Usages in Novaya Zemlya"]

[Text] Arkhangelsk Oblast—Yu. Guskov, chairman of Arkhangelsk Oblast Soviet, planned a trip to Novaya Zemlya with journalists. But it had to be cancelled for reasons beyond his control....

The Novaya Zemlya archipelago, which extends for 1,000 kilometers toward the North Pole between the Kara and Barents Seas, comes under the jurisdiction of the Arkhangelsk Oblast Soviet. But that is so to speak in law, whereas in fact the military have ruled this territory equal in size to Leningrad Oblast since the mid-1950's. Dozens of trappers' families, Russians, and Germans whose forebears had rendered this grim archipelago habitable during the last century, were moved to the mainland, while the island soviet of people's deputies was abolished.

During late September this year Yu. Guskov, chairman of the Arkhangelsk Oblast Soviet, invited me to fly out to Novaya Zemlya:

"I intend to settle in principle with the military the question of restoring the island soviet on the archipelago," Yuriy Aleksandrovich said of the purpose of the coming visit. "The military have their families with them on Novaya Zemlya. The size of the 'civilian' population is 7,000. But there is not enough comfortable housing, and the wives of officers and ensigns experience difficulties in finding jobs. An island soviet would be able to solve these and other everyday problems by drawing the archipelago into the oblast's economic system [oborot].

"In addition, our future relations must be discussed with the military. They must be mutually beneficial. My idea is to enlist the military's powerful intellectual, technological, and technical potential in solving civil problems. We have already agreed with the command of the Plesetsk cosmodrome to provide the oblast with telephones using satellites. This is far cheaper over a vast area like ours than laying cables. There are also excellent specialists working on Novaya Zemlya, and their help to the residents of the North will be simply invaluable in conditions of a market economy."

[Filippov] Yuriy Aleksandrovich, you invited a group of journalists to make a trip to Novaya Zemlya. Why?

[Guskov] The last nuclear explosion on Novaya Zemlya took place 4 December 1988. Since then the northern testing ground has been "silent," but agitation over it is on the increase. Arkhangelsk's "Novaya Zemlya-Nevada" Committee and many inhabitants in the Nenets Autonomous District are demanding that the North be declared a nuclear-free zone. I understand that Norwegian environmentalists are protesting against tests on the archipelago. I wholeheartedly support their ideas. But let us come back to earth with all its faults again: This problem can only be solved by concluding a treaty at summit level ending nuclear testing worldwide. Until then the activity of the northern testing range must be as open and public as possible. That is why I invited journalists on this trip, so that they can describe the testing range in an unbiased manner. [Guskov ends]

Yu. Guskov mentioned in conclusion that we were flying out the following day at 0800. But about two hours after this conversation I received a telephone call at my hotel saying: Yuriy Aleksandrovich is forced to postpone the trip to Novaya Zemlya; he regrets this very much and asks you to forgive him. This is what had happened. When Rear Admiral V. Gorev, with whom Yu. Guskov had secured the preliminary agreement regarding the visit, found out that journalists were coming, he flatly refused to receive the delegation. "I can make an exception for you as an RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputy and authorize your coming to Novaya Zemlya," he told Yu. Guskov, chairman of the oblast soviet. "But I cannot admit the others. This is a restricted area, and the instructions do not provide for journalists' visiting it. Go to the General Staff for authorization."

RSFSR People's Deputy Major General A. Koltunov was preparing to fly with us to Novaya Zemlya to see his voters. The garrison chief's behavior came as an incredible surprise to him.

[Koltunov] The instructions to which Rear Adm. Gorev is referring say that "the Novaya Zemlya Garrison chief is to decide questions relating to the organization of visits to the garrison by people for whom the instructions make no provision should they arise." In all probability, the rear admiral is simply unwilling to set about resolving the problems of Novaya Zemlya.

Natural Gas Deposit Confirmed in Irkutsk Oblast

PM0110140790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Report by V. Kodkin; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] Exploratory drilling at a promising gas field is continuing in Zhigalovskiy Rayon in northern Irkutsk Oblast.

[Kodkin] The drilling workers on the Krivoy Lug Expedition are drilling through to gas deposits more than 3,000 meters underground. The field, according to the geologists' preliminary estimates, contains 500 billion cubic meters of gas. Deposits of 100 billion cubic meters have already been confirmed. This seems to be the time to start building a gas pipeline which, incidentally, is envisaged by the Baykal conservation program. Gas from the Kolykhtinskiy [as heard] Field, which is virtually next door by Siberian standards, could sharply improve the ecological situation in Angarsk, Bratsk, Irkutsk, and Usolye-Sibirskoye. The residents of these cities have not breathed the fresh air of the taiga for a long time. This is because the taiga has been constricted and partially destroyed by metallurgical, oil refining, chemical, and timber procurement enterprises. [passage omitted]

Magadan Oblast Declares Land, Sea, Air Ownership

LD0110162190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 1 Oct 90

[Text] At a session of the Magadan Oblast Soviet a decision was made today in accordance with which all of the lands, minerals, and waters—including a 200,000 mile coastal zone—the plant and animal worlds, as well as the air space above the oblast's territory are declared the posession of the local soviet. By way of a legislative initiative, the session proposed that the Russian parliament consider the issue of the national-state and administrative- territorial structures of the republic. It is further proposed that autonomous oblasts and okrugs be singled out as independent territorial formations with rights as subjects of the federation. All of these decisions have provoked differing reactions among deputies.